FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 023 4 February 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

TASS Terms U.S. 3 Feb Nuclear Test 'Challenge' AA 1
Bogachev on 'Irresponsible' Test AA 1
Test Considered 'Severe Blow' [Ilyashenko] AA 1
Kudrin on Test Significance AA 2
Geneva Disarmament Conference Opens 1987 Session AA 2
NEW TIMES Discusses UK, French Nuclear Forces [26 Jan] AA 2
Gerasimov Writes on Early SDI Deployment AA 9
[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 24 Jan]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Laser Technology Talks Open in Moscow BB 1
Bogomolov Views Socialist Economic Performance BB 1
[NEW TIMES 12 Jan]
Polish Daily Interviews CEMA Representative BB 5
[TRYBUNA LUDU 19 Jan]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Gerasimov Addresses Journalists on Several Issues CC 1
Discusses ABM Treaty, SDI CC 1
Speaks on ICO Summit CC 1
Comments on DRA Cease-fire CC 2
Addresses UK Relations CC 3
Gerasimov Discusses Plenum Results at Briefing CC 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Jan]
Historian Compares Warsaw Pact, NATO Philosophies CC 4
[Petrosyan in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jan]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Bovin on USSR's 'One-Sided' View of U.S. A 1
Chernyshev Derides 'Morality' of Reagan's SDI A 1

CHINA

U.S. Conducting 'War Preparations' Near PRC B 1
[Volskiy]
RENMIN RIBAO Cited on Gorbachev Message B 2
[PRAVDA 22 Jan]
End of NPC Standing Committee Session Reported B 2
[IZVESTIYA 24 Jan]

NORTHEAST ASIA

DPRK 'Noble' Summit Initiative Endorsed [Andrianov] C 1

SOUTH ASIA

Dobrynin Receives Indian Friendship Official [IZVESTIYA 2 Feb] D 1
DRA Business Delegation Begins Talks in Moscow D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Media Examines Situation in Philippines E 1
U.S. Exerts 'Strong' Pressure [Glebov] E 1
Attempted Military Coup Fails [Ilyashenko] E 2
More on Coup Attempt E 2
[Kuznetsov in PRAVDA 1 Feb]
Constitution Plebiscite Begins [Fesunenko] E 3
'Overwhelming Number' Vote Yes [Konnov] E 3
First Moscow-Phnom Penh Satellite Link Reported E 4
[Vinogradov in IZVESTIYA 21 Jan]
Briefs: Vietnamese Leader Awarded E 4

EASTERN EUROPE

GDR's Axen Article Discusses Soviet Peace Program F 1
[PRAVDA 23 Jan]
Silayev, CSSR's Gerle Discuss Engineering [CTK] F 5
Katushev Meets With CSSR Trade Minister [CTK] F 5

WESTERN EUROPE

'Dynamic Development' in Soviet-Italian Trade G 1
Italian Trade Minister Formica Official Visit G 2
Formica, Aristov Hold Talks G 2
Italy 'Important' Partner [ANSA] G 2
Ryzhkov Receives Formica G 2
Joint Venture Protocol Signed G 3
Moscow TV Assesses French-Soviet Economic Meeting G 4
[Potopov]
W. Europe Political Pendulum Swinging to Center [Shishlin] G 5
U.S.-Spanish 'Deadlocked Talks' on Bases Continue G 5
[Serebrennikov]
Moscow Deplores U.S. Military Actions in Cyprus G 6
PRAVDA Views U.S. Building of Thule Radar Station G 6
[Kostikov in 30 Jan]
Iceland's Need for Intelligence Service Questioned G 7
[Vakulovskiy in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jan]
Briefs: British Scientific, Cultural Agreement G 8

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

CPSU Greetings to Mozambique's Frelimo Party J 1
[PRAVDA 3 Feb]
Correction to TASS Report on Machel Plane Crash J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Paraguayan CP Member Cites Workers' Repression K 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Paper Carries 'Theses' of Gorbachev Plenum Report R 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jan]
Brezhnev's Son-in-Law Arrested for Corruption R 10
AFP Notes Details R 10
TASS Announcement R 10
Ambartsumov Looks at 1987 Changes in Economy, Society R 11
[MOSCOW NEWS 4 Jan]
Butenko on Reconstruction, Social Struggle in Society R 12
[MOSCOW NEWS 4 Jan]
Gorbachev, Others Sign Actress' Obituary R 16
[PRAVDA 2 Feb]
Brochure on Jan CPSU Plenum Materials Published R 16
Elections for Supreme Soviet Scheduled for 22 Feb R 16
[IZVESTIYA 22 Jan]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Management of Foreign Economic Ties Reorganized S 1
[EKINOMICHESKAYA GAZETA Jan]

TASS TERMS U.S. 3 FEB NUCLEAR TEST 'CHALLENGE'

LD031736 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1710 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Washington, 3 Feb (TASS) -- The United States conducted an underground nuclear explosion at the testing ground in Nevada today. Thsi was reported by an AP correspondent from Las Vegas, citing a spokesman of the U.S. Energy Department. In this way the Reagan Administration, demonstratively throwing down a challenge to the world public, has again ignored the Soviet Union's call to join it in the unilateral moratorium that it announced on nuclear tests, and has reaffirmed its intention of pursuing its dangerous course toward escalation of the nuclear arms race.

Bogachev on 'Irresponsible' Test

LD031938 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 3 Feb 87

["Explosion in Nevada" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- Military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

The wire services have brought bad news: Today, February 3, the United States set off a nuclear device with a yield of 20 kilotons at the range in Nevada.

The explosion, conducted two days earlier than planned, undoubtedly will hold a special place in the Reagan administration's already odious "service record" over the past six years.

Challenging public opinion on all continents, Washington has again demonstrated its irresponsible determination to build its relations with the rest of the world in a field related to security not on the basis of generally accepted international standards but on a principle harking back to Stone Age.

As is known, for a year and a half the Soviet Union has not conducted any nuclear explosions and recently confirmed once again its readiness to further adhere to the moratorium until the first American blast in 1987.

So the President of the United States was given a chance to choose between silence at long last at all nuclear testing ranges in the world and a resumption of nuclear explosions with redoubled force.

On refusing to stop nuclear explosions President Reagan decided further to balance on the brink of the nuclear precipice.

Test Considered 'Severe Blow'

LD032331 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2022 GMT 3 Feb 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Excerpts] Today the United States carried out an underground nuclear explosion at the testing area in Nevada. [passage omitted]

I will recall the United States planned the first nuclear test for this year for 5 February. Obviously the militarist urge is so strong in Washington they decided to press on faster there. They cannot help but know in the White House that in conducting a new test the United States will therefore deal a severe blow to the Soviet moratorium which has been going on now for 547 days.

Kudrin on Test Significance

OW031455 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1135 GMT 3 Feb 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] Today is the 547th day of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. Silence has reigned on our nuclear testing grounds for 18 months. The United States has conducted 24 nuclear explosions during the same period. The 25th explosion is scheduled for day after tomorrow, 5 February. It is code named Hazebrook.

If the explosion is carried out, the Soviet Union will be forced to resume its testing in the interests of its security. But as you know, not everything is lost. The Soviet Union, even if it is forced to resume these tests, will be ready to return to the moratorium again if the United States ends its testing in Nevada. Just a few hours remain for Washington to decide.

The international community expects restraint, prudence, and wisdom. Whether or not these hopes are fulfilled remains to be seen.

GENEVA DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE OPENS 1987 SESSION

LD031149 Moscow TASS in English 1147 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Geneva February 3 TASS -- The Geneva Conference on Disarmament opened its 1987 session in the Palace of Nations today.

U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar said in a message to the forum that its work was of vital significance to all mankind and that was why the world community would be following it closely in the hope for success in reducing the dangers threatening the world as a result of the arms race.

NEW TIMES DISCUSSES UK, FRENCH NUCLEAR FORCES

PM291001 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 3, 26 Jan 87 pp 20-23

["Aleksandr Lebedev article: "Bomb for Europe? The British and French Nuclear Arsenals"]

[Text] How important are the arasenals in the overall nuclear strategic balance between East and West? How much of an obstacle are they on the way to the nuclear-free world envisaged in the three-stage plan for nuclear disarmament put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev a year ago?

Whether mankind is to move from a nuclear into a non-nuclear age and when now largely depends on the United States, but also, to no small degree, on the two other Western nuclear powers, Britain and France. Their reaction to Reykjavik, however, was close to panic-like a child from whom a favourite toy is being taken away. Strangely, even Bonn found a non-nuclear perspective frightening.

How is this to be accounted for? Is it just another spectacle being acted out on the "Atlantic stage"? Or are Britain and France really so attached to their nuclear brainchild that they are unable to part with it now (which, incidentally, no one is asking them to do) or in the future?

How Britain Went Nuclear [subhead]

A good number of prominent nuclear physicists were working in the British Isles before and in the early years of the war. Many of them had been spirited away from the continent by the British secret services under the noses of the Nazis (along with quantities of heavy water). Britain was well advanced in the development of the new, "ultimate" weapon.

Subsequently, the scientists and the research equipment were, for security reasons, moved to Canada whence, under an agreement between Roosevelt and Churchill, they were transferred to the U.S. It looked like a joint Anglo-American enterprise, a nuclear dimension to the "special relationship" between the two countries. Gradually, however, classified information came to be withheld increasingly from London until the McMahon law passed by the U.S. Congress in 1946 completely barred the British from the holy of holies of American military secrets (the law was only amended in 1958).

Britain, loth to be in the position of a rejected partner, set about developing its own nuclear weapon, first under the Labour government of Attlee and then, with renewed energy, under Churchill. In 1952 it held a successful atom bomb test in Australia, followed by a hydrogen bomb test in 1957.

Britain's nuclear potential was intended, of course, to supplement the Western military arsenal, and also to scare the peoples of its crumbling empire. "I felt that this force was important for Britain, just as similar force would be for France," Harold Macmillan said. "It was the symbol of independence and showed that we were not just satellites or clients of America." Possession of a nuclear weapon created an illusion of equality.

It has to be said for the sake of fairness that London took a guarded and responsible view of the formidable weapon, all the more so as, having accepted U.S. nuclear-armed bombers in its territory, Britain automatically became a target for a Soviet retaliatory strike. Both Attlee and Churchill, fearful of the adventurism of the Pentagon generals (who pressed for the use of the atom bomb in the 1950s, first in the Korean war and then in Vietnam) made repeated trips to Washington to restrain U.S. Presidents from rash moves.

This did not, however, prevent London from seeing its nuclear weapon as an important instrument in atomic-age diplomacy and a symbol of belonging to the select nuclear club.

The British nuclear arsenal began to lose its value with the advent of the era of satellites and ballistic missiles. Bombers became obsolete as a means of delivery and the development of the British Blue Streak missile was making slow progress.

London turned to Washington for help. However, the British were in for a disappointment. Its requests met with coolness in Washington. Influential officials-Defence Secretary Robert McNamara, Under-Secretary of State George Ball and others-tried to talk President John Kennedy out of giving American missiles to London. In the summer of 1962 McNamara openly spoke out against sharing nuclear weapons with the allies (Macmillan described his speech as "foolish"?.

Many people in the U.S. at the time spoke in favour of letting the British nuclear forces die a natural death, as they would grow obsolete. They cited, not without reason, the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the situation getting out of control. But Washington had other motives as well. It hoped to take advantage of the transition to a new generation of weapons-missiles-to assure its nuclear missile monopoly in the Western world.

Kennedy, however, did not want to risk further humiliating the privilege partner. In December 1962, after an arduous negotiation in Nassau (in the Bahamas), an agreement was signed under which the U.S. was to sell missiles for the Polaris submarines.

But Britain had to pay a heavy price. The Americans pushed us hard and many have "out-smarted" us altogether. It is very hard to judge," Harold Macmillan wrote later. Nevertheless, it is possible to judge. In return, Britain gave the Americans a submarine base in Holy Loch, Scotland. In addition, Macmillan agreed, reluctantly, to consider the American "multilateral nuclear force" project (MNF), designed to meet the nuclear claims of Bonn and other American European allies.

The labour government of Harold Wilson, which succeeded the Conservatives, honored the Nassau agreement, with the exception of one point. Mindful of the opposition in Britain to the prospect of the F.R.G. getting a nuclear weapon, Wilson resorted to a deft maneouvre (offering the patently unrealistic Atlantic nuclear force project) to torpedo the "multilateral navy," a brainchild of McNamara.

As a result, the basis of the independent British nuclear force was formed by five Polaris submarines. The status of this force, however, is somewhat ambiguous; while the submarines and the warheads are manufactured in Britain, the enriched uranium for them comes from the U.S., the charges are tested in Nevada, and targeting is done jointly with U.S. headquarters through American intelligence satellites. The British nuclear force has been placed under NATO command, with London allowed to make independent use of it only if its "highest national interests" are threatened. "Some independence, exclaimed Liberal MP Paddy Ashdown.

The French Force de Frappe [subhead]

The development of the French nuclear force followed a different course. Work in the field had begun under the Fourth Republic in the late 1940s, and was stepped up when General de Gaulle came to power in 1958. [paragraph continues]

If Britain had been able to acquire atomic and nuclear bombs, the General saw no reason why France, which had comparable resources and scientific potential, could not join the "nuclear club." Paris saw this as a symbol of restored French greatness, its actual and not merely formal return to the category of a great power. At that time de Gaulle did not rule out nuclear cooperation with the U.S. and Britain.

In fact, in 1958 Paris made a confidential proposal to Washington and London to set up a kind of "triumvirate" to run the West's affairs and pursue a concerted policy in the Third World. It was understood that in that case the U.S. would cooperate with France in the nuclear field on the same terms as with Britain.

However, while Washington reluctantly accepted the obligations stemming from its "special relationship" with Britain, it had no intention of extending the same terms to Paris. Eisenhower's reply was seen by de Gaulle as humiliating, which spurred the French effort to develop its own nuclear weapon. In 1960 the French tested their atomic device in the Sahara. However, a good deal of effort was still required to create a battle-effective nuclear force. The French thought cooperation with Britain highly desirable in view of a certain asymmetry in their achievements in the nuclear missile field. The British had their own nuclear warheads and the French had their own missile. Cooperation seemed logical and, on the eve of the Anglo-American meeting in Nassau, de Gaulle tried to persuade Macmillan to that course, stressing the prospects of West European integration and the need for greater independence from the U.S.

The British Prime Minister, who needed French backing for Britain's entry into the Common Market, was not against de Gaulle's idea but said he would leave the last word to Washington. Washington's word, uttered in Nassau, reminded de Gaulle of Churchill's wartime warning that if Britain had to choose between France and America it would always choose the latter.

When Paris realized that London's position remained unchanged, it decided to go it alone. As if to spite the British, de Gaulle signed in 1963 the Elysee treaty of cooperation with the F.R.G. and stepped up work to build an independent nuclear potential, which came to be known as force de frappe (strike force). The idea of Anglo-French nuclear cooperation was shelved but, as later events showed, not buried.

The French strike force comprised a fleet of submarines (soon to be brought up to seven), 18 ballistic missiles in silos on the Albion plateau and Mirage bombers.

In addition, the French troops stationed in the F.R.G. have Pluton tactical nuclear missiles and the Britain Army on the Rhine is equipped with U.S.-made Lance missiles.

A comparison of the British and French nuclear forces in the 1960s reveals an underlying difference. The French military doctrine of the time was based on the "all azimuths" strategy. To be sure, the use of the French strike force against the United States was highly unlikely, but it could well serve to deter the F.R.G. if the Elysee treaty began to split at the seams.

At critical moments under de Gaulle (as during the Caribbean crisis in 1962) Paris made no secret of whose side its nuclear forces were on, but for all that France always distanced itself from the more adventurist U.S. acts, for example, in Indochina or in the Middle East. It withdrew from the NATO military organizations.

The Weak Not So Weak Any More [subhead]

Let us look at the state of affairs today. Both London and Paris feel that their nuclear forces are obsolescent and are planning a drastic modernization in the 1990s. Both capitals tend to be over-modest about the size of their nuclear potentials (just a few per cent of the Soviet one).

This is not so, even if one compares present levels, not to speak of tomorrow. Today, Britain and France are estimated to possess between them about three hundred nuclear warheads. As a result of modernization, they will have about five hundred each by the beginning of the 1990s. This makes a combined total of thousand warheads. By the year 2000 the figure will have grown to some 1,500, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. But it could be much higher for the simple reason that the French M-4 and M-5 missiles, to replace the M-20s, and the Trident-2 (D-5) system to replace the British Polarises, can carry different numbers of warheads depending on the modification.

In the opinion of many experts, in the 1990s Britain will probably have not five hundred, but over a thousand nuclear warheads (1,088). This figure can be doubled by adding the French potential. The two countries' nuclear forces would then constitute a large percentage of the Soviet nuclear potential (even strategic, not to speak of the European potential).

Referring to the alleged weakness of the French nuclear force several years ago, former French minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement remarked: "The weak is not so weak anymore." And Colonel Jonathan Alford, deputy director of the London-based International Institute of Strategic Studies, has said that Britain and France have no grounds -- military (under the pretext of weakness) or political -- to refrain from nuclear weapon cuts. This opinion is shared by Thomas Hirschfeld, a former head of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

All this is being said with reference to the present situation. But the introduction of Tridents would increase the British nuclear potential 16-fold, according to Neil Kinnock. The D-5 missiles, in their speed and accuracy, belong to the category of first-strike weapons, as both British and American experts believe. But if the existing Polaris potential is an adequate deterrent, why increase it? This is the question being asked by many British experts, a question all the more relevant now that the prospect of cuts in American and Soviet nuclear forces is being discussed.

Why, indeed? After all, London and Paris have repeatedly stated that if the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. make deep cuts in their nuclear forces, they will follow suit. Even after Reykjavik, when the British and French leaders, contrary to their former declarations, have tended to look on the idea of a nuclear-free world as at best a goal for a very remote future, they still magnanimously agree to the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. eliminating half their strategic weapons.

Suppose this does happen. The Soviet and American strategic potential would then comprise 6,000 warheads on each side. Britain and France would meanwhile have increased their forces by at least 5 or 7 times. Some two thousand Anglo-French warheads to 12,000 Soviet ones is one thing, but the same number constitutes a third of 6,000. Combined with 6,000 U.S. warheads, they would give the West a considerable lead. The British and French nuclear weapons would make the West's superiority even more impressive if a "zero option" in medium-range missiles were to materialize.

The arithmetic involved is simple enough, and so are the policies: to try to gain an edge on the U.S.S.R. under the pretext of the "independence" (for which read "not counting") of the British and French nuclear forces. These forces are independent of the Soviet Union, but not of the U.S. and NATO. This is so not only because of the formal status and level of operational interaction between the British, French and American nuclear forces, but also because of the dramatic change in the policies of Britain, France and their closest allies.

Let us think back to the 1960s. At that time the French and British leaders, like their West German counterparts, made repeated moves towards detente in Europe and the world.

London (under a Conservative government) played a positive role in the drafting of the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, and of the 1967 nuclear non-proliferation treaty (under Labour), as well as in the early stages of the tripartite talks on a total ban of all nuclear weapon tests. Can Britain in the 1980s boast of at least one notable constructive idea to help break the deadlock in the disarmament negotiations, or check the arms race?

In France, too, much has changed since the time when de Gaulle dreamed of a "united Europe" from the Atlantic to the Urals on the basis of "detente, concord and cooperation." The leaders who have since come to power espouse a different philosophy. There has been a thaw in Franco-American relations as the once sharp divergences on many international issues have been blunted. The world "Atlanticism" has lost its former negative connotation in the French lexicon. Correspondingly, the positions of Paris and London have drawn closer together. The French no longer describe Britain as the American Trojan horse in Europe.

The degree of harmony in transatlantic relations should not of course be overestimated: Friction and fierce arguments recur in the Washington-London-Paris-Bonn "quadrangle" and in the Anglo-French-West German "triangle." New axes are being formed and once stable politico-geometrical figures are falling apart. Contradictions persist and will not go away.

But we are not here concerned with this aspect of the objective processes at work in the Western world. Rather, we would like to draw attention to the following facts. While 10-15 years ago the West European countries came up with independent initiatives that tended to improve the international climate and to some extent induced the U.S. to take (or comtemplate) steps in the same direction, nothing of the kind can be observed today.

The reverse seems to be the case. London, Paris and Bonn are anxious to warn Washington (much, one suspects, to its pleasure) not to be carried away by an accommodation with Moscow. They seem almost genuinely concerned lest the the U.S. should "over-reduce" its strategic weapons (which are meanwhile being increased), lest the Americans should be too hasty in removing their medium-range nuclear missiles from Europe (while in the meantime more and more of them are being deployed).

It is in this context that one has to assess the role of the British and French nuclear forces both as a military and political factor on the side of the NATO and West, whatever their formal status.

It is no accident, perhaps, that the British and French nuclear potentials are often referred to as Anglo-French. This may not be so in legal and operational terms. Not yet. But the idea of close cooperation between the two nuclear submarine fleets periodically becomes the subject of lively discussion, especially when the Anglo-American nuclear cooperation agreement is up for renewal or the problem of modernization arises.

In the early 1970s, the London papers wrote that Britain was going to offer to sign a "nuclear pact" with France. There was of course a good deal of exaggeration in this, as well as a two-pronged diplomatic ploy. London sought to curry favour with Paris to get into the EEC. By the same token, it wanted to blackmail Washington should it begin to have second thoughts about its nuclear alliance with the British.

Eventually, the problem of Britain's entry into the Common Market was resolved and the U.S. extended the Anglo-American nuclear cooperation agreement. Michel Debre, the then French Defense Minister, commented that France should now wait for another date with Britain in the creation of the next generation of nuclear weapons. Such a moment has now come, and contacts between the two capitals have become more active. During their Paris visit last autumn, David Steel, leader of the British Liberal Party, and David Owen, leader of the Social Democratic Party of Britain, discussed the possibility of nuclear cooperation between the two countries, notably the prospect for having the French M-4 missile replace Tridents on British submarines.

Margaret Thatcher, during her visit to Paris in November of last year, avoided giving a clear answer on the possibility of concrete cooperation, but did not deny that the subject may come under discussion. Speculation on this score is undoubtedly fuelled by the statements of the French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac (for example, in his speech at the assembly of the Western European Union in early December) on the need for a "European defense" backed up by an Anglo-French nuclear deterrent.

It is notable that the Bonn government looks at such ideas with keen interest (the Social Democrats on the whole support the British Labor Party's line on renunciation of the nuclear weapon). It looks as if the F.R.G. is still hoping to gain access to nuclear weapons rather than just granting its territory for these weapons. Bonn would like to see the Anglo-French "nuclear bomb" as a "European deterrent" and would like to have a say in decisions on its use, possible within the framework of the Western European Union, which is now being reviewed.

Whether or not a "European nuclear force" will even be formally organized, one things is clear even today. The nuclear forces of Britain and France, separately or together, represent a formidable weapon targeted on the U.S.S.R. Moscow's tolerance of it does not mean that it does not notice them. Simply the U.S.S.R. is trying not to complicate the process of reduction of the two largest nuclear potentials-the Soviet and the American. The British and French nuclear forces remain outside the brackets, as it were, at their present level. But to go ahead and build them up, while pretending that nothing is happening, is less than gentlemanly, to say the least.

How do British and French politicians justify their insatiable passion for nuclear warheads? This will be the subject of our next article.

GERASIMOV WRITES ON EARLY SDI DEPLOYMENT

PM031155 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 24 Jan 87 p 7

[Gennadiy Gerasimov "Saturday Commentary": "SDI Sophistry"]

[Text] They kept telling us: What are you worried about, the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) is purely a research program, a journey into the unknown with an uncertain outcome. Maybe something will come of it, maybe not. Paul Nitze, the leading U.S. Government expert even proposed rigid criteria for giving SDI the go-ahead. Specifically, the planned ABM defense was to be truly impenetrable and the creation of additional means to penetrate it was to be more expensive than its reinforcement.

Only having travelled this long and thorny path, equivalent to at least seven Manhattan projects (for the creation of the atom bomb) would it be possible to decide where to go from there -- whether the ABM defense would be deployed [razvertyvat] or whether it was not worth the cost.

Consequently, the U.S. agreement to abide by the 1972 treaty on the limitation of ABM defense systems for another 8-10 years was interpreted by some people as presenting necessity as a virtue. There was no reason to abandon the treaty earlier since SDI would take at least 10 years to materialize.

Then suddenly U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger gets up and opens his mouth; he is saying what the Pentagon has been thinking about. The Defense Secretary is saying that it is necessary to deploy [razvertyvat] "the first phase of ABM defense" "as soon as possible," preferably "within the next few years." Naturally, the defense secretary blabs out, the first phase must serve as a basis for nationwide defense.

All kind of questions are cropping up. What has happened to Nitze's criteria? What has happened to the statements about SDI being purely a research program at the present stage? What has happened to respect for the ABM Treaty? Is it still a treaty which the United States will observe in the course of the next 10 years, or is it no more than a crumpled piece of paper?

A revision of the timetable for deployment [razvertyvaniye] calls into question the U.S. position at the Geneva talks. Secretary of State George Shultz explains: "According to the proposal as it stands and given the right circumstances, a pledge to observe the existing treaty -- that is, not to withdraw from it or in other words, to refrain from deployment [razvertyvaniye] for a period of 10 years -- is envisaged. Of course, with time, this could be amended."

By "amended" he means of course shortening the period in question. But this is, after all, a fundamental issue -- the reinforcement of the ABM Treaty provisions. Shultz is warning that an "amendment" aimed at annulling the ABM Treaty provisions is possible.

The questions are multiplying. "Is the Reagan administration adhering to the stance adopted in Reykjavik?" -- THE WASHINGTON POST asks. "Is it sticking to Reagan's promise not to deploy SDI in the next 10 years or is it moving toward reviewing this position?"

The cacaphony coming out of Washington is even baffling people with the sharpest political hearing. Weinberger is pressing on with "the first phase," Shultz is threatening an "amendment," Reagan is keeping mum. Weinberger is talking about a territorial ABM defense, about a "shield above the continent" rather than above specific targets.

Whatever the case may be, it is possible to note a departure from the thesis that SDI is a "research" program. It is possible to note that this departure places those U.S. allies who have agreed to take part in SDI research in an awkward position. This is the case with Japan, for instance, which has stipulated that its participation should be confined to research only.

Senators W. Proxmire and B. Johnston and representatives of the public organization Union of Concerned Scientists held a press conference in Washington 20 January in the course of which they opposed an early or a phased deployment [razvertyvaniye] of ABM defense componenets.

Experts estimate the cost of the "first phase" at approximately $100 billion.

All this, it was pointed out at the press conference, will not be of substantial significance either for the protection of the country's population or the defense of military installations. It will however undermine the process of arms control and disarmament negotiations.

Most probably this is where the explanation has to be sought for the U.S. Defense Secretary's sudden bout of importance: The aim is to physically remove every possibility of reviewing the U.S. decision on the creation of ABM defense.

At the same time Max Kampelman, the U.S. representative at the Geneva talks, says that the United States is sticking to the promise not to deploy [razvertyvat] ABM within the next 10 years which it gave in Reykjavik.

THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote 21 January:

"It is becoming increasingly difficult for Americans to believe that President Reagan really wants to establish control over nuclear arms together with the Soviet Union at a time when he has lost control over his own administration as regards this problem."

So what are other people to believe?

CEMA LASER TECHNOLOGY TALKS OPEN IN MOSCOW

LD032205 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1135 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 3 Feb (TASS) -- Today a meeting of experts from CEMA countries on technological laser devices for cutting, welding and thermal treatment, began here. In the course of 4 days participants at the meeting will examine a wide range of matters connected with the setting up and introduction of special lasers, tables of coordinates [koordinatnykh stolov] manipulators and control systems with numerical program control based on microprocessors. The speeding up of a joint work in this sphere is envisaged by the comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress of CEMA countries up to the year 2000.

BOGOMOLOV VIEWS SOCIALIST ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

PM211511 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 1, 12 Jan 87 pp 32-33

[Article by Oleg Bogomolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System: "Speeding Up Advance"]

[Text] The positions of the socialist countries in the world economy are primarily determined by their production, scientific and technical potential, the dynamics of their economic growth. Between 1971 and 1985 the total national income of the socialist countries increased on the average by 5.2 per cent a year, and in the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) by 4.6 percent. The correspondent figures for the industrialized capitalist states and the developing nations were 2.9 and 4.9 percent.

In the last 15 years the proportion of the socialist countries in the world's output of electricity went up from 23 to 27 per cent, oil from 18 to 28 per cent, gas from 22 to 39, steel from 30 to 38, mineral fertilizers from 33 to 45 per cent, metal-cutting lathes from 39 to 53, tractors from 47 to 58 per cent, and so on. Yet the proportion of the socialist countries in the world's output of most advanced materials and high-technology products was appreciably lower than the proportion of their basic industries.

In the same period, however, economic efficiency, the expenditure of fuel, energy and materials per unit of output in the socialist countries and their proportion in world trade did not improve and even worsened as compared with world average indices. In the European member countries of CMEA, for instance, power and metal consumption per unit of output is approximately 40 and 60-70 per cent higher on the average than in the European Economic Community while labour productivity is roughly 60 per cent of that in the EEC states.

There is still a considerable gap between the economic development levels of the socialist countries. The ratio of per capita national income in the less and more developed socialist countries (China and Vietnam, and Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic) is about 1 to 5. A marked gap in the rates of economic growth exists not only between these two groups of countries but also between the European member-states of CMEA.

Compared with the other socialist countries, the German Democratic Republic (G.D.R.) has achieved the best results in the intensification of its economy. [paragraph continues]

Between 1981 and 1986 its national income steadily increased by 4.5 per cent a year, more than in any other European socialist country. Agricultural labour productivity has risen in Hungary, the G.D.R., Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia. Hungary's agro-industrial complex has a vast export potential. Czechoslovakia is practically self-sufficient in basic foods, while the G.D.R. and Poland hae substantially cut their food imports. However, in the Soviet Union and a number of other CMEA countries agriculture does not yet meet the growing demand of the population in food.

In most European socialist countries economic growth slowed down appreciably in the 1970s and early 1980s as a result of objective changes in the conditions of reproduction and because the economic policy and management had not been timely adapted to these changes.

The 27th Congress of the Communist Party became a radical step towards working out a new economic strategy. It set the objective of accelerating the social and economic development of the country and attaining the world's heights in labour productivity and in scientific and technological progress.

The restructuring of the economy on a new technical basis will eventually lead to a marked growth of the efficiency of production and of the national income. At the same time the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries shows that mistakes in structural policy cost them dearly and that the quality of planning is a matter of exceptional importance.

Other levers of growth, requiring no big investment or additional manpower, are being brought into action. For instance, a return on investment can be increased primarily by modernizing the available production capacities, and not building new ones, by saving power and resources, and not expanding the output of fuel and raw materials, though this must be done too.

The reorganization of the economic mechanism (an extensive reform of t is mechanism in the Soviet Union) and mobilization of the creative energies of the people should become a decisive instrument of economic acceleration at its first stage. It is hardly possible to estimate today in terms of output to what extent the introduction of a more flexible management will accelerate Soviet economic growth. Harder still is it to estimate the economic effect to be brought by a new attitude of people to work ensuring from consistent implementation of the principles of social justice. It can be supposed that these changes will play a no smaller part in the acceleration of our development than new machines and technology.

Most countries of CMEA are planning a modest increase of their economic growth rates in 1986-90. During this period the total national income of the European members of CMEA exclusive of the Soviet Union is expected to rise by 3-4 per cent a year. These countries are laying emphasis on the balanced growth of their economies and foreign ties, on the improvement of qualitative rather than quantitative parameters of development. More capital will be invested and the share of accumulation in the national income raised in those countries where it has dropped noticeably in the past few years. Modernization of the economies of the CMEA countries, of their economic structures will increasingly help to speed up their development.

The initial positive results in carrying out its economic stabilization programme have been achieved by Yugoslavia, where economic growth was an estimated four per cent last year.

The past few years have seen a rapidly growing role of China in the economy of the world community and of its socialist part. Compared with other great powers, China has the highest rate of economic growth. Between 1981 and 1985 its national income grew on the average by 9.9 per cent a year, industrial output by 11.4 per cent. An equally dynamic growth was observed in the expansion of China's foreign economic ties. Such a rapid growth is attributed to deep-going positive changes in the social life of the country, in the economic reform that was initiated in the rural areas and is now being gradually introduced in industry and all other spheres of the economy.

The reorganization in China is not plain sailing, of course. Baneful inflationary tendencies have appeared in particular, and social differentiation has increased. The supply of industry with fuel and raw materials is insufficient. A big balance of payments deficit has arisen. All this compels Chinese leaders to modify the economic policy and curb investment and the rates of growth lest the economy become overheated.

The level of economic development still remains very low, of course. But China with its one billion population and considerable natural resources has a vast potential for growth. The leaders of that great country have learned a great deal from the stern lessons of the past. The experience acquired by them lessens the probability of serious economic micalculations in the future and helps to plan a doubling of the national income by the end of the century. The Chinese economy will grow increasingly open, and the country is to become a large exporter and importer of a wide range of goods.

Many socialist countries are today faced with largely similar problems of improving the economic management. This once again proves that modern socialism has tendencies and laws of development common for all countries which have chosen it, and this fact must not be ignored. Moreover, deviation from the common laws of the new society, violation of these laws created difficulties in the social and economic spheres and even crisis situations in separate socialist countries.

Lenin never considered the transition of different countries to socialism to be a uniform process. Complete socialism, he wrote, will be created by international cooperation, a series of attempts each of which will inevitably be one-sided and insufficient, but it is the sum of these attempts, the generalization of collective experience that will produce an optimal model of a new society.

This is a well-known truth. However, in economic practice little attention is still paid to an analysis of the diverse forms and methods of socialist reform. Yet such an analysis is very important because the multiformity of present-day socialism reflects the diversity of national state interests of individual countries, and these interests should be taken into account in the same way as the common needs of development of the socialist world.

Such a need today is the joint use of the advantages offered by the internationalization of economic life. In the socialist world system, where the principal social aims of its countries coincide, this internationalization brings considerable material and other benefits for each of them. This is evident from the integration of socialist countries within the framework of CMEA.

The interaction and mutual complementing of national economies have reached a degree where the progress of each of them depends on the progress of integration cooperation. [paragraph continues]

It may be recalled, for instance, that the value of the exchanges of goods and services on the market of CMEA constitutes about one fifth of the total national income of its member countries.

The decisions of the CMEA economic summit held in 1984 and the comprehensive programme for scientific and technical progress of the CMEA states till the year 2000, adopted at the end of 1985, became milestones in the integration cooperation. In line with these decisions large-scale agreements and programmes are being drawn up or carried out for multilateral cooperation in machine building, electronics, power generation and the saving of resources. The coordination of plans for 1986-90 has in the main solved big problems related to the supply of the CMEA states with fuel and raw materials. One of the ways to meet these needs is pooling the efforts of different countries in the construction of fuel- and raw-material-producing complexes. About 400 Soviet organizations and over 1,000 plants and organizations in other CMEA countries are involved in implementing the comprehensive programme for scientific and technical progress.

The experience gained until now helps to tap new reserves for extended integration linked primarily with an improvement of the quality, technical standards and competitive power of many products and with a bigger supply of goods scarce on the CMEA market. In the 1970s and 1980s the volume of products conforming to world qualitative and technical standards did not increase in reciprocal exchange while the proportion of foods and consumer goods dropped. The rates of growth of reciprocal trade will go up in the future and begin to outstrip more than ever the economic growth of the countries concerned.

The CMEA states are faced today not only with the task of a more flexible coordination of their economic policies at government level, but also with the need to draw immediate designers and producers of new equipment into international cooperation and to facilitate direct contractual ties between them. Now that technology is making rapid progress, the effectiveness and the dynamics of growth of international specialization and co-production increasingly depend on the mechanism of direct ties.

To give a fresh impetus to socialist integration, the Soviet Union has taken steps to reorganize the management of its foreign economic activity. Implementation of the relevant decisions adopted by the party and the government last August is expected to overcome the gap between industry and foreign trade and to make factories interested in raising the efficiency of export and import. Some other countries of CMEA are reorganizing their foreign economic mechanisms, and the international mechanism of cooperation and activity of CMEA bodies themselves is to be revamped. The policy of extended integration within the framework of CMEA is combined with the desire of its member countries to expand mutually beneficial cooperation with other socialist states. Such cooperation with China has been growing especially rapidly in the past few years.

Any brief survey of the economic situation in the socialist world naturally omits some aspects and concrete facts but emphasizes the main thing -- despite the numerous problems the process of intensification and reorganization of the economy is gaining strength in the socialist countries.

Table 1. Rates of Growth of National Income and Industrial Output in Socialist Countries (percent of the previous year)

	National Income			Industrial Output		
	1984	1985	1986 (estimate)	1984	1985	1986 (estimate)
All socialist countries	5.2	5.1	4.7	7.1	7.6	5.2
CMEA states	3.6	3.6	4.2	4.4	3.0	4.7
Bulgaria	4.6	1.7	5.5	4.2	3.2	4.3
Hungary	2.7	-0.9	1.5	2.8	0.9	1.2
Vietnam	5.8	3.7		16.9	13.6	
G.D.R.	5.5	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.4	3.8
Cuba	6.1	4.2	3.0	10.8	4.0	2.0
Mongolia	4.5	5.4	5.6	9.0	7.8	7.3
Poland	5.8	3.2	4.0	5.2	4.5	4.4
Romania	7.7	6.0	7.0	7.4	5.2	7.0
U.S.S.R.	3.2	3.5	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.1
Czechoslovakia	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.9	3.6	3.1
China	13.5	12.3	6.0	14.0	18.0	8.0
Yugoslavia	1.7	0.4	4.0	6.0	3.0	4.0

Table 2. Foreign Trade Turnover of the Socialist States (percent of the previous year)

	1984	1985	1986 (estimate)
Bulgaria	8.6	7.4	5.0
Hungary	8.8	0.6	5.0
G.D.R.	8.4	3.6	1.0
Cuba	8.0	9.6	
Mongolia	7.4	8.0	5.0
Poland	12.5	7.2	3.0
Romania	13.1	2.5	
U.S.S.R.	9.6	1.3	-8.0
Czechoslovakia	10.2	5.3	3.0
China	22.8	30.0	10.0
Yugoslavia	3.7	2.2	-1.0

POLISH DAILY INTERVIEWS CEMA REPRESENTATIVE

AU221120 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 19 Jan 87 p 6

[Interview given by Aleksey Antonov, CPSU Central Committee member, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Soviet permanent representative in CEMA, to NOVOSTI commentator Aleksandr Drabkin: "Technological Progress Is Our Joint Line" -- date and place not given]

[Text] [Drabkin] What is the role of the "Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technological Progress of the CEMA Member-Countries through the Year 2000" in the development of socialist economic integration?

[Antonov] We want to go over to coordinated scientific-technological cooperation. The realization of this comprehensive program helps to speed up the socioeconomic development of each fraternal country and to reveal more fully the entire potential of socialism. This is the joint view of all CEMA countries.

[Drabkin] Does this mean that the realization of the program in question will result of progressive changes in the very structure of CEMA economic cooperation?

[Antonov] Undoubtedly. At present it is mainly trade contacts that dominate CEMA relations, but these contacts are based on interbranch exchanges, which have economic and at times physical limits. For example, for obvious reasons the USSR is unable to promote ad infinitum the export of fuel and energy raw materials. However, this is not necessary because the complete conservation of resources is an important line of scientific-technological progress. Following this line, CEMA countries continue to change the structure of their mutual contacts.

We seek to create a system of cooperation that would be mainly based on intrabranch scientific-technological cooperation. It is impossible to realize the comprehensive progam without such a system. In this way the program is a factor in stimulating scientific-technological progress and in the further development of CEMA countries' economic cooperation. This was stressed at a recent CEMA session.

[Drabkin] This means that the program for technological progress determines in advance a new mechanism for cooperation?

[Antonov] Yes.

[Drabkin] How important is economic cooperation with the fraternal countries for the USSR?

[Antonov] The share of the CEMA countries in our overall foreign trade amounts to almost 55 percent, a figure that speaks for itself. However, accomplishing the tasks of intensifying the economy and accelerating the socioeconomic development of the USSR call for exploiting all available production reserves and for expanding and intensifying econmic contacts primarily with the socialist countries. It is not just a "global" growth we are interested in, but qualitatively new cooperation and active searches for new solutions.

[Drabkin] Could you give a specific example of such searches?

[Antonov] The USSR has defined an extensive range of the powers held by industrial combines, plants, and scientific-technological organizations in the area of cooperation with foreign countries and continues to reconstuct the system of the links between these combines, plants, and organizations, on the one hand, and foreign trade agencies and higher bodies, on the other. These measures are part of the recent resolutions adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, which are entitled "On Resources Concerning Improvements in Running Economic and Scientific-Technological Cooperation With Socialist Countries." These resolutions are part and parcel of the efforts to intensify international economic integration in line with 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

Soviet industrial combines and plants have been granted all the rights necessary to promote an extensive development of direct contacts with partners in CEMA countries, to establish mutual cooperation, and to set up joint plants and international combines and organizations.

New elements in planning economic contacts with foreign countries continue to make an appearance. [paragraph continues]

For example, as of 1987, measures concerning the development of socialist economic integration, including the realization of the comprehensive program, will be listed in a special chapter of the USSR economic plan and in separate rubrics of the plans of the ministries and central offices of the USSR, the Councils of Ministers of union republics, industrial combines, and plants. It is expected that joint plants established in the USSR will enjoy extensive independence and will operate on the principle of fiscal autonomy. Their profits will be shared among their members in proportion to their production output.

[Drabkin] CEMA mass media continue to pay much attention to direct contacts between plants and economic and scientific research organizations of the socialist community countries and to joint international plants. How does this look in practice?

[Antonov] The Soviet Moskabel plant and the GDR Wilhelm Pieck Kabelwerkoberspree combine have maintained friendly contacts for a long time now. Thanks to their close cooperation and the participation of the Soviet All-Union Scientific Research Institute of the cable industry, it has been possible to greatly reduce the schedules for launching the production of telecommunications cables of world standards for the transmission of light. At present, exploiting the experience of the GDR friends, the Moscow plant and a chemical plant continue to adapt the production of long-range cables made of high resistance polystyrene. This will make it possible to increase productivity in the most difficult sector of production by 10-15 percent.

The direct contacts between the Vilnius Construction Machine Combine and the Hungarian Mechanikal Muvek Plant -- these contacts were established by the accord signed 10 years ago on scientific-technological cooperation and coproduction of high pressure component parts for painting equipment -- have crucially helped to raise the reliability of equipment and to reduce the consumption of paints.

The cooperation between the Prague CZKD-Elektrotechnika Plant with a similar plant in Leningrad accelerated the production of high-power air-cooled asynchronous engines and of new insulating materials.

Contacts between plants can also be used for more profound forms of cooperation -- for joint international plants and combines. The Soviet-Bulgarian scientific and production combines of the machine tools industry called Ivanovo-Sofia and Krasnyy Proletariy-Beroye are examples of such contacts. They have been in operation for over a year and have had really good results. The Ivanovo-Sofia specialists have developed extensive exchanges of complementry component parts so that 319 machining lines were set up in the USSR and 134 in Bulgaria. In the Bulgarian town of Pazardzhik the IR-200 new machining line, which was developed in Ivanov, is now in operation. The new machining lines of the IS-500 and IS-800 series (IS stands for Ivanov-Sofia) represent a truly joint production of an international combine. The new lines have been highly evalutated by specialists, and Western orders for them continue to come in.

The Krasnyy Proletariy-Beroye international scientific and production combine produced over 2,000 robots in the first year of its operation. The efforts of joint design teams have helped to accelerate the designs of new products and to shorten their production schedules.

Other joint combines, which are now being set up, follow the same policy. The Kalibr plant in Moscow has been cooperating with the General Swierczewski precision equipment plant in Warsaw for over 25 years, during which enough practical knowledge has been amassed to suggest the idea of setting up the Soviet-Polish scientific-production combine. Both sides are interested in this venture because the Polish plant owns technologically sophisticated (and unique) machine tools, not all of which are in operation, and because the Kalibr plant is short of such tools, but has a great potential for assembling and installing various machine tools. Now we want to ensure that this international combine is technologically as well as economically useful to its members.

[Drabkin] Are mutual benefits a problem?

[Antonov] Formal barriers to the development of direct contacts and to the establishment of joint economic organizations have already been eliminated, but the thing is that it is not easy to raise plants' economic interest in using these forms of cooperation. Differences in the price system and other economic mechanisms employed by individual CEMA countries produce certain difficulties in agreeing to prices on cooperative production or coproduction. Development of large-scale cooperation also continues to be hampered by the impossibility to solve a number of convertible currency and fiscal problems. The times when CEMA regarded such problems as secondary are over.

Recently some CEMA countries, including the USSR, have defined foreign cooperation pursued by their national economic units. CEMA countries continue to realize measures aimed at extending the powers of the their economic and scientific-technological organizations and at creating conditions for their direct cooperation for the purpose of accelerating the CEMA comprehensive program.

GERASIMOV ADDRESSES JOURNALISTS ON SEVERAL ISSUES

Discusses ABM Treaty, SDI

LD031445 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1404 GMT 3 Feb 87

["Statement by USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Feb (TASS) -- Today is the 547th day of silence at Soviet nuclear test sites. Over those 547 days nuclear blasts have been conducted 24 times in Nevada. This was said by Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, when he spoke at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists here today.

We have suggested to the United States that they should come to their senses and stop, he said. We have reminded the U.S. and the world that the United States has, in any case, already conducted many more explosions than the Soviet Union. We have warned the United States that we cannot go on endlessly giving them a head start.

Recalling that there are only 2 days until the nuclear weapon test planned by the U.S. Energy Department, Gerasimov said that by all accounts U.S. militarism has got the bit between its teeth. Further confirmation of this is provided by the statements by U.S. Administration spokesmen about the possibility of a staged deployment [razvertyvaniye] by the United States of a large-scale ABM system at the beginning of the nineties. If, as individual components envisaged under the SDI program are developed [razrabotka], there begins within a certain period of time a staged deployment [razvertyvaniye], then it will no longer be a case of research, as the U.S. Administration stated earlier, but of the practical conversion of space into an arena for the arms race. This step will abrogate the ABM Treaty, which prohibits the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of both limited and large-scale ABM systems with space-based elements. These plans contradict the aims and tasks which are the subject of the nuclear and space weapons talks in Geneva.

Such a prospect alarms the Soviet Union, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed. We shall be attentively following the development of the situation.

Speaks on ICO Summit

LD031552 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- It is pointed out with satisfaction in Moscow that the message of greetings addressed by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the Islamic Conference in Kuwait met with a positive response there, said Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry. He was addressing a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen here today.

We have noted, he said, the closeness and in many respects concurrence of our views on such issues as the need to put an end to the Iran-Iraq war as soon as possible, to achieve an all-embracing and just Middle East settlement, on the issue of the crisis in Lebanon and on the situation in southern Africa.

It is gratifying that the Soviet proposal to set up a preparatory committee for the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East met with explicit and unequivocal support also at the Kuwait conference following the nonaligned meeting in Harare and the 41st U.N. General Assembly session.

Attention was drawn in Moscow to the resolution of the meeting on Afghanistan, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said. It is important, in the first place, to see that the wish expressed in it for the return home from Afghanistan of the limited Soviet military contingent is consonant with our own intentions. If the Islamic nations see this outstanding issue as an obstacle in the way of the development of our relations, we in Moscow are prepared to work sincerely and jointly in order to eliminate it. We hope that the same goodwill will be also shown by the Moslem countries which are wittingly or unwittingly joining in the attempts at interfering in Afghanistan's home affairs. A continuation of the dialogue on these issues could contribute toward better understanding of what is happening around Afghanistan, to contribute towards putting an end at the earliest date to outside interference in the affairs of the Afghan people and help towards successful development of the process of national reconciliation in that country.

Comments on DRA Ceasefire

LD031542 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1424 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 3 Feb (TASS) -- It is now more than 2 weeks since the forces of the DRA unilaterally ceased fire on a nation-wide scale. The process of national reconciliation is acquiring ever more precise organizational forms, and is becoming filled with concrete content, stated the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry Gennadiy Gerasimov. He spoke here today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists.

The work that has been actively begun by the commissions for national reconciliation, that have been set up in various regions of Afghanistan, is already producing results, he noted. A dialogue has been started with opposition forces. A large number of armed detachments and groups have responded to the call for a cease-fire. By today about 6 million Afghans, who had previously been the "fighters" of various Ilamic groups, have returned to peaceful life. Among the Afghan refugees who are in Pakistan or Iran there can be heard ever more insistent demands that the Pakistani and Iranian authorities grant them the right to leave for their homeland without hindrance. More than 10 million Afghans have returned to Afghanistan in recent days.

At the same time, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted, there are facts indicating there has been an increase in supplies to the major counterrevolutionary groupings making up the so-called "Alliance of Seven" of the most modern weapons from the United States and other Western countries, "for a struggle to the end." These weapons include the latest modifications of the "Stinger" and "Blowpipe" missiles.

Lately, there has been an intensification of missile bombardment of government troops, economic targets, population centers and Soviet targets, for provocative ends aimed at breaching the truce.

Recalling that a vehicle packed with explosives had been blown up next to the Indian Embassy in Kabul last Sunday, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said that the enemy is taking aim not only at the process of national reconciliation and at a settlement around Afghanistan but also at traditional Afghan-Indian friendship. The main thing, he stressed, is that despite provocations and fierce resistance from external and internal reactionaries, the process of reconciliation is continuing to develop.

Addresses UK Relations

LD031641 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- In recent days, such leading British figures as Margaret Thatcher, Geoffrey Howe and Timothy Renton have made statements apparent in which is the wish to tell the world that the current British Government "has deserved the respect of the Russians" only due to firm reliance of the former on the positions of strength policy. It looks like they in the White Hall have started a campaign of self-advertisement on the eve of the election campaign in that country. A statement to this effect was made by Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, at a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen here today.

We view the election campaign starting in Britain as her purely domestic affair. Yet we are resolutely against this so to say "interpretation" of the development of Soviet-British dialogue and relations in various fields, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry recalled.

It is apt to recall in that connection that we are interested in developing relations with Britain, but not more than she herself is interested in developing relations with us. This is a reciprocal process and should be done from both directions, honestly and respectfully towards the partner. This is also in Britain's best interests.

GERASIMOV DISCUSSES PLENUM RESULTS AT BRIEFING

PM031213 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Jan 87 p 5

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] A routine briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists was held 29 January at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center.

G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, dwelled on world reaction to the CPSU Central Committee plenum. It may be noted the plenum was greeted with interest and most frequently with well-intentioned interest, he said: Well-intentioned interest from those who want to see in the Soviet Union a self-confident and thus calm and responsible partner in international affairs. Characteristic in that respect was the speech of Italian Prime Minister B. Craxi, who noted that "the present signals must be received attentively and must be approached without oversimplification or prejudice." At the same time Italian Foreign Minister G. Andreotti believes, according to the newspaper LA REPUBBLICA, that what is taking place in Moscow should be assessed in the United States as a signal to lend new impetus to the dialogue between the two superpowers and to resume the talk left unfinished in Reykjavik.

As for guarded interest, it comes from those who are afraid of the growth of the Soviet Union's international prestige, which, of course, will be the inevitable consequence of the restructuring and renewal of our society. There are those whom it would entirely suit for stagnation to continue in our country.

Dwelling on R. Reagan's "State of the Union" message, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman drew attention to the fact that, as the first comments from the United States itself show, this traditional message has met with a highly critical reception in U.S. political and public circles. Many commentaries stress "the gulf between rhetoric and reality." One may agree with this assessment.

Verbally the President is stating his readiness for "dialogue" and "the establishment of more constructive relations with the Soviet Union." Yet in fact on each of the issues relating to the field of Soviet-U.S. relations on which it touches the message is imbued with a spirit of confrontation and inveterate anti-Sovietism. It includes falsified data on Soviet military expenditure, attempts to hold our country responsible for the tense state of affairs in the world, and a phony explanation of the reasons for the lack of success at the disarmament talks.

Replies were given to journalists' questions, in particular about the situation in Afghanistan, over Lebanon, and in the city of Varosha (Cyprus). An assessment was given of the U.S.-South Korean military exercises.

HISTORIAN COMPARES WARSAW PACT, NATO PHILOSOPHIES

PM281509 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jan 87 (no edition noted) p 3

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel E. Petrosyan, candidate of historical sciences: "The Vain Attempts of Imperialist Ideologists To Undermine the Unity of the Warsaw Pact Member-States"]

[Text] There is incontrovertible evidence that ideological subversion by certain U.S. circles and their NATO allies against the socialist states has become an integral part of imperialism's militarist preparations. The theoreticians of anticommunism display special zeal in mounting slanderous attacks on the Warsaw Pact. The most bellicose aggressive circles clearly find the collective defense of the gains of socialism unacceptable. They literally leave no stone unturned in their vain attempts to undermine the socialist community, to drive wedges between the fraternal states, and to set them against each other.

Various "theories" called upon to "prove" that the Warsaw Pact Organization is an instrument of "Soviet hegemony in East Europe" have become relatively current in the West in recent years.

The British bourgeois ideologist M. Mackintosh, for instance, claims that the Warsaw Pact is an "instrument of Soviet military and political control over East Europe and also over its allies' armed forces." His colleague R. Johnson alleges in turn that the Soviet Union exercises "hegemony" over the countries of East Europe and uses the Warsaw Pact to maintain "Soviet control" over these countries.

The anti-Soviet bias of this malicious slander is perfectly obvious. [paragraph continues]

The authors of concepts of this kind are trying to prove that the military-political alliance within the framework of the Warsaw Pact allegedly goes against the socialist countries' national interests, impairs their independence, and accords only with the interests of the Soviet Union. It is appropriate to recall here what kind of "independence" the anticommunists are advocating for the socialist countries. T. Stanley, a prominent Western ideologist, expressed himself very frankly on this subject. In his book "NATO in Transition. The Future of the Atlantic Alliance" he wrote: "The best of all possible worlds would be a world in which a united and cohesive West would confront a communist camp split into different groupings."

The very practice of the fraternal socialist countries' cooperation shows that membership in the defensive military-political alliance fully accords with both the national and state as well as the international interests of all its members on the basis of full equality and respect for their independence. The equitable and fraternal nature of the relations between the member-states of this combat alliance has been expressed in legal terms in the treaty.

Within the framework of the Warsaw Pact a collective discussion of topical international problems takes place, coordinated stances on key foreign policy questions are elaborated, and steps are taken to improve the socialist defensive coalition and strengthen the organizational foundations of the military-political alliance. When the Warsaw Pact was signed, the foundations were laid for a mechanism which provides for the discussion of general political problems affecting all its participants. This role was entrusted to the Political Consultative Committee, which is at the head of the Warsaw Pact Organization. Its activities are aimed at consolidating the political and military foundations of the alliance and strengthening the Warsaw Pact member countries' independence. The Political Consultative Committee does not play the role of a supranational body and therefore the decision and recommendations which it adopts are not and cannot be based on diktat by some countries toward others.

By means of all kinds of pseudoscientific concepts imbued with the spirit of rabid anticommunism and dyed-in-the-wool anti-Sovietism and distortions and lies aout the nature of the Warsaw Pact Organization, the lackeys of imperialism are trying to ascribe to the defensive military-political alliance of the socialist countries the features of strong-arm pressure and political diktat characteristic of imperialist military blocs.

Using these malicious fabrications as a cover, U.S. and NATO militarist circles are further escalating the arms race in the hope of disrupting the existing approximate military-strategic parity between the Warsaw Pact and NATO and achieving decisive military superiority over the socialist countries. The authors of these calculations have learned little from historical experience. After all, their delirious fantasies did not come true even when the might of imperialism exceeded manyfold the strength of the new system which was just taking shape. How can they hope to "stifle" socialism today when it represents a whole world system and is stronger then ever before?

The attempts of imperialist ideologists to distort the essence of the Warsaw Pact, to ascribe to it a nonexistent contradiction with the principles of international law, and to distort the nature or relations between the socialist states are futile. The Warsaw Pact is entirely in keeping with the aims and principles of the United Nations and with the letter and spirit of the UN Charter. It is open to any European state which shares its aimes, and in this it differs fundamentally form imperialist military blocs.

The Warsaw Pact Organization was established 6 years later than NATO as a countermeasure to the increased military threat presented by the imperialist powers. All the activities of the fraternal states' combat alliance serve as a powerful factor for peace and stability in international relations. After all, it is a fact that throughout its existence the Warsaw Pact has not unleashed a single military conflict or caused tension in any part of the world. Over the past 30 years the socialist community countries which make up the alliance have put forward more than 100 initiatives and proposals aimed at strengthening peace. A realistic path toward strengthened European security was outlined in the Warsaw Pact member states' Budapest Appeal. The draft document on complementing the mandate of the Stockholm conference with the reduction of armed forces and arms in Europe and a parallel discussion of confidence-building and security measures which was submitted by the Polish delegation at the Vienna meeting was welcomed as a constructive step toward disarmament by most CSCE particpant states.

At the same time the militarist policy and practice of the imperialist NATO bloc has brought the world more thena once to the brink of a dangerous world nuclear missile war. Suffice it to say that not a single act of aggression of any importance has taken place without NATO's participation or support since 1949, the year when NATO came into existence.

And so, no matter what demogoguery and tricks the lackeys of imperialism resort to, the main source of the danger of war, violence, and international brigandage was and remains NATO -- the militarist block of the imperialist states. Meanwhile, the fraternal socialist countries' defensive military-political alliance, which operates in accordance with the principles of the United Nations, presents itself to the whole world as an instrument for strengthening peace and people's security. In the complex international situation the extension of the Warsaw Pact, in accordance with the unanimous decision of its participants, was of great significance.

The fraternal parties regard the Warsaw Pact as a reliable shield protecting the gains of socialism and they express their invariable determination to continue to strengthen the socialist countries' defensive military-political alliance. The session of the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers' Committee in Warsaw reaffirmed the desire to further expand military cooperation between the allied countries and to strengthen the unity of the fraternal armies.

The fraternal states' communist and workers parties are countering the attempts of the ideologists of anticommunism to bring about a split in the fraternal family of socialist states, to undermine world public confidence in the Warsaw Pact, and to weaken its political prestige and military might with a clear program for strengthening the unity of their ranks.

They are unanimous in their belief in the great significance of their defensive military-political alliance both for the joint defense of the gains of socialism and for the successful struggle to forestall a nuclear war.

BOVIN ON USSR'S 'ONE-SIDED' VIEW OF U.S.

LD040901 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Excerpts] With Soviet-American relations all but in a deadlock at the moment, people on both sides are analyzing the causes of the disagreements between the two countries. That was the goal of a roundtable discussion in Moscow last week. Officially the subject of the discussion was The United States-the USSR: How We Look at Each Other. [passage omitted]

Since the subject of the discussion was how we look at each other, the participants also discussed how the image of the United States is painted in the Soviet Union. Aleksandr Bovin, a popular political observer, made these comments:

[Begin Bovin recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] Well in fact, I would like to repent because of how Soviet newsmen describe America. You see, if we look at our televisions what picture of American everyday life do we see? We see, for example, an unemployed [person] standing in line, or we see a homeless person sleeping in a box, or a beggar. It's true, you cannot deny that there are such people in America, and one can hardly say that that kind of reporting is an attempt to create an enemy image because you don't feel hatred, but rather pity for these people. And yet that is a one-sided picture of America, and maybe this is a result of our own inferiority complex. I don't know, maybe this kind of description of America in a way compensates psychologically for the enemy image created of us in the United States.

However, let's look at another level of describing America, when it comes to politics -- that's what I do. To my mind, on the whole we describe American politicians as more primitive than they are in reality. We do this by withholding, as a rule, most of their arguments from their speeches. When we state their position we give only one side of it. So you could say that here we have a certain element of creating an enemy image of a not very intellectual, not highly educated person who views the world in a black and white only.

At the same time, when one reads scientific books by American authors about, say, the public consciousness in the United States, certain characteristics coincide with ours. For example, a high-handed attitude among Americans towards other nations, the idea that the American nation was born to lead the world. At any rate, I think we need to give a more impartial picture of the United States. However, when talking about this enemy image problem I think Americans are guilty of many more sins. We have never made and it is totally inconceivable that we could make anything like the ABC miniseries "Amerika." [end recording] [passage omitted]

CHERNYSHEV DERIDES 'MORALITY' OF REAGAN'S SDI

LD032024 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

In his message to the national religious broadcasters annual convention, President of the United States Ronald Reagan declared that "a system of protection like SDI is morally superior to a system of devastating nuclear retaliation", that, furthermore, SDI would open new opportunities for maintaining peace.

One might agree with the President that there is, certainly, no high morality in a threat of nuclear retaliation. People the world over see the need for opening the dangerous situation. But how can this be done? How can a change for the better be achieved? What will really be in keeping with high moral criteria? There can be only one conclusion: To get rid of the Sword of Damocles, or speaking the language of our age, the nuclear sword looming over human civilisation.

The declaration of the head of the White House about "moral superiority" of SDI can only cause surprise. It can be recalled that even such a zealous proponent of the "Star Wars" programme as the Pentagon's chief Caspar Weinberger once admitted that there is a muddle in the discussion of moral aspect of SDI. And this muddle stems from the fact that its morality cannot be proved no matter what invented argumentation is used.

First, SDI is a programme to create weapons, and weapons directed not only against missiles, but also against targets in the atmosphere and on earth. Furthermore, this programme is aimed not at elimination of nuclear arms but at the creation of still more intricate and more lethal nuclear weapons.

Second, what the star warriors have in view is not the elimination of a system of nuclear retaliation but supplementing such an American system which space arms. They in Washington want to make "obsolete and impotent" Soviet weapons of retaliation, while upgrading and building such American weapons. This aim was openly proclaimed by U.S. official representatives more than once. Caspar Weinberger, for instance, said outright that creating SDI, the United States will also have a powerful "strategic triad" for dealing a devastating nuclear strike. And assistant of the Pentagon's chief explained that even after the deployment of a large-scale ABM system with space-basing elements, security will still be based on "nuclear deterrence forces."

Third, contrary to Ronald Reagan's assertions that SDI makes reaching agreements for a reduction of nuclear arsenals more likely, SDI is a barrier to such an agreement. This was confirmed at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik, at the Geneva talks. And elementary logic, too, shows that reducing offensive arms when there is a threat of the deployment of SDI means assisting "star warriors" in their striving for strategic superiority.

All this shows that the White House has its own notion of morality, different from that of the whole world. A threat to humanity with nuclear strikes from space, preserving and even enhancing the effectivity of the U.S. "system of nuclear retaliation" while neutralising such a system in the opposite side, ensuring exclusive security for the United States and enhancing the threat for all others -- this is what the current U.S. Administration regards as highly moral.

Very indicative in this respect are recent pronouncements by Richard Perle in Munich. Foolishness bordering on absurdity, this is how he described suppositions that one fine day the world can be rid of nuclear armaments. Thus, Perle shattered the main propaganda thesis of the President, his declarations that a world free from nuclear arms is his aim, and said out loud what the White House is really thinking of.

U.S. CONDUCTING 'WAR PREPARATIONS' NEAR PRC

OW262337 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 23 Jan 87

[Volskiy commentary]

[Text] Facts have proved that the U.S. Administration is attempting to continue its militarist policy by refusing to abide by SALT II and by testing MX and Trident missiles and other new laser weapons. U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger and his assistant secretary, Perle, have continued to issue belligerent statements concerning U.S. actions, which threaten global and regional peace. For example, they talked about increased U.S. military threats against Nicaragua, sending U.S. warships to the Persian Gulf, and the provocative U.S. stand impeding Afghanistan's national reconciliation. The United States plans to hold increasingly large military exercises in the Sea of Japan, the South China Sea, and the Sea of Okhotsk. The spearhead of this policy is primarily directed at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries allied with it.

Nevertheless, it is also directed at China to a considerable extent, despite the fact that the United States is trying its best to seek cooperation with China. This can be verified by the U.S. war preparations and political provocations themselves. These actions are being conducted in areas near China's border. It is no accident that the regional conflicts instigated by Washington -- from the Iran-Iraq war and the situation around Afghanistan to the undeclared war in Cambodia and the tensions on the Korean peninsula -- surround the People's Republic of China from the south, west, and east. U.S. military bases in Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Pakistan are threatening China. It should be pointed out that there are U.S. nuclear weapons and their carriers on many of these bases, just as there are nuclear weapons on warships of the U.S. 7th Fleet that cruises along China's coast. Some of the weapons can reach China's coastal as well as hinterland areas.

In fact, imperialism is holding nuclear weapons over the heads of the Soviet Union and the PRC. Imperialism has its inherent logic in pursuing a policy against the stand of these two socialist countries. To imperialism, socialism is totally unacceptable. This policy is hostile to the Soviet Union and also to China on very important issues, including foreign policy issues. Let us point out two such issues: First, the issue of space militarization. Both the Soviet Union and China oppose space militarization and advocate conquering space for peaceful purposes, but the United States is striving to realize its so-called SDI plan or Star Wars program. Second, both the Soviet Union and the PRC have promised not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, but Washington and its allies in the West not only refuse to undertake such a commitment but place their hopes on using nuclear weapons first; that is to say, they regard the dangerous unleashing of a nuclear war that would destroy everything, including mankind, as the basis of their ideological theory.

We also want to point out that the question of space militarization is closely related to the question of launching a first strike with nuclear weapons. U.S. imperialism is trying to ensure, through its Star Wars program, that it can launch a first nuclear strike free from punishment. The Soviet Union and its allies are determined to maintain the military equilibrium.

One year ago, Soviet leader Gorbachev put forward a proposal for eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of this century. It is obvious that the realization of this proposal accords with the fundamental interests of the people of all countries.

To realize this proposal calls for unified action by the people of all countries, first of all the people of the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union and China. The similar stand taken by these two countries on some major issues, such as the nonmilitarization of space and no first use of nuclear weapons, shows that it is possible to realize this goal. The 27th CPSU Congress pointed out that there is great potential for Sino-Soviet cooperation. This is true. The potential is based on two closely related and inseparable concepts for peace and socialism. If imperialism, proceeding from its class interests, opposed world socialism and threatens it with a nuclear war, the defense of peace resolutely requires the unity and efforts of the Soviet Union and China, as well as other socialist and progressive forces.

RENMIN RIBAO CITED ON GORBACHEV MESSAGE

PM291557 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jan 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Our Common Concern" and under the rubric "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival": "Beijing"]

[Text] China's RENMIN RIBAO publishes under the headline "The Soviet Union Reaffirms Nonwithdrawal of Arms Reduction Proposals" a report on the message by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee [to the "Delhi Six"]. The newspaper cites the Soviet leader's statement that the Soviet Union does not withdraw a single one of the proposals made in Reykjavik aimed at sharp reduction and subsequent liquidation of all nuclear means and at ensuring a peaceful outer space above our planet. The message, RENMIN RIBAO notes, also says that the USSR agrees to take advantage of the six countries' proposal to assist in monitoring the termination of nuclear explosions.

END OF NPC STANDING COMMITTEE SESSION REPORTED

PM301209 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "China: Routine Session of PRC National People's Congress"]

[Text] Beijing, 23 Jan -- The routine session of the PRC National People's Congress [NPC] Standing Committee has ended.

A resolution "On Stepping Up Education in the Spirit of Legality To Maintain Stability and Unity" stresses the need to resolutely combat the ideological current of bourgeois liberalism which has spread in China, the advocates of which reject the guiding political principles enshrined in the PRC's Fundamental Law. It notes the impermissibility of actions designed to violate legality, public order, and work, production, or study discipline.

Session participants confirmed the agenda for the Fifth Session of the National People's Congress, Sixth Convocation, which will be convened 25 March.

A decision was taken to appoint Zhou Guangzhao president of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. He was previously vice president of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. Teng Teng, who until recently held the post of vice minister of the PRC State Science and Technology Commission and deputy director of the CCP Central Committee Propaganda Department, was appointed vice president.

The session adopted the "PRC Customs Code."

DPRK 'NOBLE' SUMMIT INITIATIVE ENDORSED

LD030025 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 2 Feb 87

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Igor Charikov; Boris Andrianov commentary]

[Text] I do not imagine there is any need to recall how a potentially dangerous source of conflict arose on the Korean peninsula. That is well known. It is much more important to point out that the situation there remains as explosive as ever. The United States bears responsibility for this. For it is precisely they who wish to perpetuate the division of Korea and who regard the south of the peninsula as a springboard for aggression against the DPRK and other socialist countries in Asia.

There is a vast concentration of nuclear weapons belonging to the Pentagon on South Korean territory, which has turned the region into a powder keg. Nonetheless, the United States is reinforcing its military presence in South Korea. At least one fact serves as confirmation of this -- in the new financial year, the Washington administration intends to allocate almost $150 million to expand U.S. military bases in the south of the Korean peninsula.

It is not difficult to understand the significance in such conditions of each step aimed at eliminating the source of a serious threat to international security in the region. The more so when establishing lasting peace on the Korean peninsula is indissolubly linked to the global questions of restraining the arms race and achieving nuclear disarmament. This is why, in his message to the UN secretary general, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev placed particular emphasis on the fact that the Soviet Union, concerned at the increasing militarization of the southern part of the Korean peninsula, is resolutely in favour of the efforts of the DPRK to unite the country in peace and its proposals for setting up a nuclear-free zone on the whole of the Korean peninsula.

Last month, the DPRK made one more gesture of goodwill and officially put to South Korea the suggestion of holding military and political summit talks in the interests of achieving detente and peace in Korea, and of setting up the conditions for the peaceful unification of the country. At these talks it would have been possible to examine the questions of reducing the armed forces, putting an end to the arms race and large scale military maneuvers, and other issues, which, if solved, would have facilitated the normalization of the political and military situation on the Korean penisula. However, Seoul and Washington paid no attention to this peaceful initiative and, as if to justify this stance, the Western media, as if by command, have unleashed a slanderous campaign of attacks on the DPRK, aimed at undermining its authority in the international arena and reducing to nought Pyongyang's efforts toward settling the problems of Korea.

In spite of these intrigues, the progressive circles of world public opinion hold in high esteem the noble purpose of the DPRK's suggestion of talks. This aims to reduce the level of military and political confrontation on the Korean peninsula and promote the rapprochement of north and south in order to implemlent the fervent desire of the Korean people for national unity. This would be a substantial contribution to ensuring lasting peace there, which in turn would facilitate the process of establishing security for Asia as a whole.

DOBRYNIN RECEIVES INDIAN FRIENDSHIP OFFICIAL

PM031423 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendly Meeting"]

[Text] There was a meeting on 30 January between A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Darbara Singh, member of the Indian National Congress-Indira (INC-I) working committee and leader of the Friends of the Soviet Union Society delegation which has arrived in Moscow to take part in events devoted to India's national holiday -- Republic Day.

During the conversation, which proceeded in a warm, friendly atmosphere, mutual satisfaction with the dynamic development of Soviet-Indian relations was expressed. It was stressed in particular that the visit by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to India and his talks with Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi raised the multifaceted cooperation between the USSR and India to a qualitatively new level.

D. Singh showed great interest in the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum and in M.S. Gorbachev's plenum report on restructuring and the party's cadre policy. He said that the innovative ideas and conclusions contained in the report have aroused a broad response among the Indian public, which closely follows life in the friendly Soviet Union.

In this connection D. Singh was given a detailed explanation of the party's strategic course aimed at speeding up the country's socioeconomic development and qualitatively transforming every aspect of Soviet social life, and the questions discussed at the CPSU Central Committee plenum.

The Soviet side expressed its willingness to receive an INC party delegation for more detailed discussion of all CPSU activity in this connection. D. Singh expressed his gratitude for this opportunity.

T.N. Kaul, Indian ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

DRA BUSINESS DELEGATION BEGINS TALKS IN MOSCOW

LD032340 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- A delegation of Afghanistan's business circles headed by minister for financial and economic matters Fazel Haq Haleqyar [name and title as received] opened talks today at the USSR State Committee for External Economic Ties.

Questions of the possible participation of private Afghan firms in developing economic and technical cooperation between the USSR and the DRA are being discussed in the talks which will last till February 6.

Being discussed, in particular, is the cooperation of Soviet organisations and these firms in the building in Afghanistan of enterprises of the light, food and tannery industries.

MEDIA EXAMINES SITUATION IN PHILIPPINES

U.S. Exerts 'Strong' Pressure

LD011949 Moscow World Service in English 1530 GMT 1 Feb 87

[Mikhail Glebov commentary]

[Text] Tensions are mounting in the Philippines where a national referendum on a draft constitution is to take place soon. Details from our observer Mikhail Glebov, who writes:

The country is the scene of continuous plots staged by supporters of former President Marcos. The more recent events are taking a sharper and unexpected turn. Even Marcos' elderly mother, who had mysteriously disappeared from the hospital, is drawn into the whirlwind of political intrigue.

The present government of Corazon Aquino is under fire both from the right and from the left. It is quite difficult to unwind the knot of intrigue and struggle for power in the country, yet there are clear indications that the United States has a hand in it. American politicians are doing their utmost to make their influence on the situation in the Philippines less conspicuous than it was a year ago. One year ago the American naval presence in the area was at its peak, and Washington's special envoys, observers, and military advisers were practically pouring into the country from across the Pacific. When a military coup was uncovered last autumn, the American ambassador to the Philippines, Stephen Bosworth, insisted on his mediation between the government and the Army rebels and thus directly influenced the course of events.

Speaking of the latest attempted coup, the press once again underscored the presence of American specialists in the Philippine capital at the time of the coup. In mid-January, American naval vessels returned to the area. The Filipino right-wing forces criticize the present government for having too much democracy in the country; the left blames the government for too little democracy. What is the American stand? It has been openly defined more than once. The United States is interested in preserving American military bases in the country. The draft constitution speaks of a possible nonnuclear status of the Philippines. Thus, if the national referendum approves the draft, this would clearly undermine American military presence in the area.

Such is the reasoning behind the efforts of the United States to frustrate the plebiscite and topple the present government by siding with Filipino right-wing forces. A government representative at the talks with the Muslim community in the south of the country, Agapito Aquino, drew the public's attention to the close links between the country's right-wing groups and the American CIA. The Manila-based DAILY EXPRESS noted that the American decision to obstruct the process of normalization in the Philippines is aimed first of all at preventing the national referendum on the draft constitution. It may also be aimed at creating chaos that would give pro-American generals the opportunity to seize power and oust the present government. There may be other secret motives determining American policy toward the Philippines, but one thing is clear: The country is under strong American pressure and this pressure has a destabilizing effect.

The American policy runs counter to all assertions that in the Philippines the United States wants peace and democracy. Washington's sole desire is to continue dominating its former colony and preserving its military bases there.

Attempted Military Coup Fails

OW292353 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1135 GMT 29 Jan 87

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] Another military coup, just a week before the referendum on the new draft constitution, has failed in the Philippines. I should remind you that the previous attempt was carried out by the supporters of former President Marcos in July last year. The mutineers then seized the Hotel Manila. This year, they dug in at the television center. For almost 2 days, the mutineers held out there. Ramos, chief of the general staff of the Armed Forces of the Philippines said that they numbered no more than 190 men. The military command issued an ultimatum to the mutineers. They accepted it, and left the television center building after some delay. Police and troops continue to patrol Manila streets. Tension is gradually dropping in the city, and life is returning to normal.

It appears that the coup attempt was undertaken to destabilize the situation in the Philippines and hinder the conducting of the referendum planned for 2 February.

The events of the last 2 days speak of extremely high passions and deep polarization of forces in the country. All the reactionary forces have ganged up against the democratic government of President Aquino. They include both the supporters of President Marcos, overthrown a year ago, and all kinds of rightist parties. Not restricting themselves to antigovernment demonstrations, they are taking the course of armed action.

Washington is not indifferent to events in the Philippines. The United States is, of course, against the return of the Marcos military dictatorship, which has discredited itself. U.S. politicians, concerned about the fate of their military bases in the Philippines, are trying to put pressure on the Aquino government through the hands of its political enemies. Their goal is extremely clear, they want to impose on the Philippines a course suitable to Washington.

More on Coup Attempt

PM031447 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Feb 87 First Edition p 5

[L. Kuznetsov dispatch: "Philippines: Plot Crushed -- Threat Remains"]

[Text] The failure of the attempted coup d'etat is still the main event in the Philippines' political life. There is no single attitude toward the rebels or their actions. Representatives of left-wing and nationalist organizations are demanding a thorough investigation and, naturally, punishment for the participants in the antistate actions. However, defenders of the "guilty parties" are also taking vigorous action.

The rebels themselves relied on anticommunism and on the fact that they were "aiming to defend democracy from the communist threat." And this, by all accounts, is their main trump card. Speaking to journalists, R. Tolentino, one of the participants in the military putsch, stated that he is a member of a 65,000-strong organization created in the armed forces under the name "Guardian Brotherhoods." "Our appearance in Manila" (to participate in the putsch -- L.K.), R. Tolentino continued, "was dictated by the decision to show the masses that the armed forces are not slumbering. We are prepared to serve the cause of war against the communists.

Philippine President Corazon Aquino, speaking in Davao, reaffirmed her administration's resolve to put a stop to any attempts by the regime's enemies to destabilize the government and wreck the holding of the plebiscite scheduled for 2 February on the draft new constitution.

Constitition Plebiscite Begins

OW031345 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1120 GMT 2 Feb 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] Filipinos today are heading for the ballot boxes. Early in the morning -- it was 0200 in Moscow -- a plebiscite on a draft constitution began in the Philippines. About 25 million registered voters must express their attitude today on the document prepared by the Corazon Aquino government.

It is proper to recall that the plebiscite is being held only 7 days after a coup attempt undertaken by a group of military putschists. Because of this, 79 battalions of the Philippine Army have been brought into a state of combat readiness to ensure order.

Well, early reports show that the situation in the country on the whole remains quiet, despite attempts by the rightist forces -- these attempts are taking place -- to create tension and disrupt the referendum.

For example, just a few hours before the beginning of voting, three homemade bombs were exploded simultaneously in the country's capital. Fortunately, there were no fatalities. The police have already arrested two extremists in Manila who were found to have 120 sticks of dynamite and detonators in their possession.

Judging by Philippine press reports, one gets the impression lately that, on the whole, the country welcomes inclusion into the new draft constitution of articles on the introduction of a nonnuclear policy for the Philippines and even on the elimination of U.S. military bases.

By the way, you are watching a report on preparation for voting. The electoral commission is holding the last rehearsal, so to speak, before today's referendum. Now to continue my thought. Many warn that these articles are accompanied by reservations -- the articles stipulating that the Philippines must follow a nonnuclear policy and, perhaps, remove U.S. bases. These articles are accompanied by reservations, which could be used to distort their meaning and prevent their implementation.

According to the results of a public opinion poll held on the eve of the referendum, it is expected that about 70 percent or more of the voters will vote for the government draft. We shall know this evening whether this is so. The preliminary results for the decisive Manila electorate will be known after 1900 Moscow time, while, of course, it will be several days before the preliminary results for the country on the whole will be known.

'Overwhelming Number' Vote Yes

OW040623 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0430 GMT 4 Feb 87

[From the Novosti newscast; Viktor Konnov commentary]

[Text] The counting of votes in the constitution plebiscite in the Philippines is continuing. Our commentary:

[Konnov] Hello, comrades. The final results will not be known until the end of the week. However, it is already clear that the overwhelming number of Filipinos who turned out voted in favor of the draft constitution. At this stage, the figure mentioned is 78 percent in favor.

The voting took place under calm, but difficult, internal circumstances, only a few days after an attempted coup. The former President Marcos, who was behind the conspirators, even prepared a unique video message to his supporters. [video shows Marcos exercising] The object of this video recording is to show that his health is excellent. As Marcos said: He would have been proud to head this group of patriots.

This is how the voting went in Manila. President Corazon Aquino is voting. [video shows voting in progress, Aquino casting her vote] By the way, she recently turned 54.

This is Enrile, the former minister of defense, who was deposed at the end of November last year, and who is in practical terms, leader of the opposition. [video shows Enrile voting]

And this is how the vote counting took place, already showing Corazon Aquino has won. [video shows vote counting]

It was not a slip of the tongue when I said that President Aquino had won. Although the plebiscite was on the constitution, many observers nevertheless view this more as a vote of confidence in the Aquino government.

As far as the constitution itself is concerned, the significant sections deal with the extension of Aquino's rule to 30 June 1992, as well as the Philippines' nuclear-free policies and the abolition of U.S. military bases. As a rule, progressive elements in the country welcome these proposals. At the same time, they warn that the stipulations included in the draft constitution could be used to prevent the practical implementation of these proposals.

FIRST MOSCOW-PHNOM PENH SATELLITE LINK REPORTED

PM301421 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 21 January 1987 in its Morning Edition carries on pages 1 and 4 under the headline "Phnom Penh's Mirror in Space" a 1,000-word dispatch by own correspondent V. Vinogadov. The report is carried under the general heading "Reports From Abroad" and comprises the first reportage relayed to Moscow from the PRK capital via a direct space link from the "Intersputnik" space communications station. Vinogradov reports that with the completion of the station Cambodia now has a direct link with Moscow, Kabul, Hanoi, Vientiane, and Paris and will soon add Berlin to that list. Cambodia has joined the international space communications organization "Intersputnik" and is linked to Asia by a Statsionar-13 satellite which will be operated "initially" by Soviet specialists under contract, who will then train Cambodian technicians to operate the station themselves.

BRIEFS

VIETNAMESE LEADER AWARDED -- By decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Do Muoi, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers, has been awarded the Order of the October Revolution. The award is in honor of his active participation in the revolutionary movement, his services in reinforcing the friendship and all-round cooperation between the USSR and the SRV, and his 70th birthday. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Feb 87 LD]

GDR'S AXEN ARTICLE DISCUSSES SOVIET PEACE PROGRAM

PM281200 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jan 87 Second Edition p 4

[Article by Hermann Axen, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee, under the rubric "For a Nuclear-Free World, for Mankind's Survival": "A Program That Offers Hope"]

[Text] Berlin -- Heinrich Mann, who took the side of the working class in the struggle against reaction and fascism, called peace the strongest need of the human race. Peace, as this great writer and humanist put it, is a truly human passion.

In the history of human civilization, the noblest thinkers, the most valiant fighters for social progress have always called for peace. Nonetheless, bloody wars of aggression have always taken place. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels established that the society of exploitation gives rise to the danger of war and to wars because of its very nature. The authors of the theory of scientific socialism substantiated the historical liberation and peace mission of the proletariat and gave all mankind the key to the door behind which opens the path to true peace between peoples. The policy of a ruling working class, Karl Marx wrote, will be a policy of peace, because its internal structure will be based exclusively on the labor principle.

When, some 70 years ago, the Russian proletariat, under the leadership of Lenin's party, took their fate in their own hands and began to build a new socialist society, the struggle for peace on the planet found a concrete platform the first time in history in the form of Lenin's famous Decree on Peace.

The historic feat accomplished by Soviet power in order to defend the socialist motherland and victoriously end World War II never will be forgotten. At the same time, we cannot forget the fact that influential representatives of international monopoly capital, during and after that war, would not give up their attempts to exert military pressure on socialism and bring it to its knees. In the interests of its own security and the cause of peace, the Soviet Union was forced once and for all to eliminate first the monopoly of the atom bomb, and then U.S. nuclear superiority. Socialism had to secure military-strategic parity with imperialism.

It was a long and hard struggle to ensure that the ideas of the anti-Hitler coalition on the new postwar world and the policy of peaceful coexistence firmly determined relations between states with different social systems and the joint life of states and peoples.

Since the formation of the community of socialist countries, the seed sown by the Decree on Peace of the first worker-peasant state has put forth shoots. Peace on earth has been preserved for more than 40 years. The USSR and socialism make considerable sacrifices to this end, not least in order to strengthen their own defense. Hundreds of millions of people come out actively for the noble cause of peace throughout the world. The peoples can breathe but cannot yet breath freely.

Through the fault of the aggressive circles of imperialism, as a result of their reckless desire to secure military superiority over socialism, weapons of previously unheard-of destructive power are now stockpiled on earth. New types of lethal weapons are constantly being created. [paragraph continues]

If they are used in a nuclear war, all life on earth will be destroyed; all social progress will become impossible. Therefore, the preservation of peace in our time meets the highest class interests of socialism and the international working class. In today's world the historic peace mission of the workers' movement therefore plays an even more important role. The workers' movement bears the responsibility, in the true sense of the word, not only for the existence and victory of the working class and socialism, but also for life and for the further development of mankind in general.

The time is ripe for a new approach to questions of ensuring peace on the planet.

There is a growing awareness in the world that despite different and opposing political and ideological views, we must learn to live together. The nuclear and space age demands that we smooth things out between us. There arises quite logically from this the need to find new forms and methods in relations between systems, states, and regions, so as to ensure peace and resolve other global problems. The most reactionary and aggressive forces connected with imperialism's military-industrial complex resist this.

As a result, despite all the manipulations carried out in Western public opinion, the contradictions are becoming increasingly clear between the vast majority of mankind, who are committed to peace, and the numerically small but powerful, extremely aggressive, and extremely militarist imperialist group that believes that a war can be waged and won and which is preparing for it. Today ever increasingly broad circles of the monopoly bourgeoisie are realizing that military clashes between socialism and imperialism would mean universal catastrophe. They realize that a nuclear conflagration would benefit no one. At the same time, they sense that material preparations for nuclear war are increasingly detrimental to the capitalist process of reproduction.

A sober analysis of today's international situation shows that in the face of the real danger of a world war using nuclear weapons, the policy of peaceful coexistence, substantiated by Lenin, gains new weight.

Although for the socialist countries it already represented the most favorable opportunity for developing relations with countries in the other system, now it has become the only possible form of relations between states with different social systems. Peaceful coexistence between such states does not, of course, eliminate the struggle and competition between socialism and imperialism or the historical confrontation between classes. However, it is crucial to ensure that irreconcilable ideological and social contradictions are not transferred into interstate relations and are in no circumstances resolved by military means.

The socialist society -- as was decided at the 11th SED Congress and at the congresses of the other fraternal parties -- has embarked on the implementation of impressive plans for the sake of those who are building it. In the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America the peoples are struggling to overcome as rapidly as possible the grave legacy of colonialism and neocolonialism. In the capitalist countries the working people demand the implementation of their vital political, democratic, and social interests; but a worldwide atomic conflagration would make any progress impossible.

That is why the peoples, governments, parliaments, and parties and organizations in the West and East, North and South greeted with such great hope the program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world put forward by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January 1986. [paragraph continues]

It opens up a true prospect of peace for mankind. The program proposes the sole reasonable alternative to war and the decline of human civilization. Comrade E. Honecker quite rightly called this impressive proposal "the 20th century peace charter."

Since the time of its proclamation, this program has inspired hundreds of millions of people throughout the world and given them new strength. The delegates to the 11th SED Congress assessed the USSR's creative approach to questions of world policy as a "new stage" in our peace policy. "We fully approve the proposals put forward by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev and adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress and take part in their implementation. They accord entirely with our ideal of a world without weapons and violence, a world where every people freely resolves the question of its paths of development. The Soviet initiatives are meeting with a broad, approving response everywhere," Comrade E. Honecker said at the 11th SED Congress.

This program formed the basis for the subsequent proposals of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee in June 1986 on reducing armed forces and conventional arms. We now use the broad concept of arms limitation and effectively verifiable disarmament, covering all types of weapons and all spheres -- earth, water, air, and space.

What is new is that the realization of this concept is now sought not only by the socialist countries and peace-loving social forces in the nonsocialist world; in recent years mighty collaboration has grown up all over the world between supporters of peace, and this has assumed an until now unheard-of political and social scale. Not only parties, parliaments, public organizations, religious communities, scientists, artists, doctors, and sportsmen are raising their voices in support of averting the threat of nuclear war and of arms limitation and reduction; more and more governments and countries, and even whole groups of states, are calling for peace.

Apart from the socialist countries, today, as the Harare conference showed, more than 100 nonaligned states actively call for peace. The initiative of the six states from four continents and their declarations adopted in Delhi and Mexico City showed that a new grouping of states has emerged, advocating peace.

Here mention must be made also of the Contadora and Support Groups, the OAU, the Arab League, and also the countries of the South Pacific region, which recently concluded a treaty on turning this region into a zone free from nuclear weapons.

In the course of the 41st UNGA session, only two states voted against the draft resolution on creating a comprehensive system of peace and international security, and only three states came out against the majority's demand for an end to all nuclear tests. And only the United States voted against preventing an arms race in space.

The Soviet proposals of 15 January 1986 enriched the content of the dialogue begun in Geneva between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan. Their basic ideas became part of the discussion at the Reykjavik summit. In the Icelandic capital it became obvious that these bold Soviet proposals are realistic. The response of the peoples and states to Reykjavik confirms that M.S. Gorbachev's initiatives are shared by the peoples and supported by the majority of states of the globe.

Therefore it was natural that the American delegation at the talks could not close its eyes to this bold project. Historic accords proved to be very close at hand. However, the top representatives of the U.S. Administration did not want to take a historic decision. They insisted and continue to insist on treaty support for the so-called "Star Wars" project to open a loophole for themselves to pursue the arms race in space, create first-strike capacities, and achieve military-strategic superiority.

The peoples will never issue a kind of insurance policy for the senseless SDI project, which would enable the military-industrial complex to receive permission to seek profits and world domination. True security will not be created by a new, even more dangerous weapon placed in space, but only by effective arms limitation and disarmament. What sense is there -- the peoples ask -- in disarming on earth and, instead, siting uncontrollable systems of destruction in space?

In the citadels of capitalism, in the United States itself, in the states of Western Europe, and in Asia, there are intensifying disputes about the "pros" and "cons" of the inevitable new approach to international policy. The more fiercely the belligerent representatives of the military-industrial complex cling to their historically obsolete way of thinking and acting and push at all costs their policy of confrontation and the arms race, the more pressure there will be from the peoples and from those realistic circles of the ruling class that want to survive.

The GDR attaches very great significance to the implementation of the socialist peace strategy. The threat of war must never again originate from German soil; it must be a focus of peace.

At enterprises and institutions our working people are guided by the slogan: "My workplace is my sector of the peace struggle." The positive results of the successful conversations held by Comrade E. Honecker during his meetings with leading statesmen of capitalist countries, especially those belonging to NATO, served the cause of peace and cooperation and increased the international prestige of the German socialist state.

A new stage of the struggle to prevent nuclear catastrophe has begun. The GDR unconditionally supports the program for the total elimination of all types of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and the creation of an international security system. It consistently advocates the full implementation of the Soviet proposals submitted in Reykjavik. It supports the Budapest appeal of the Warsaw Pact states to the NATO states and other European countries on the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms.

If the decision is made to eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe, the siting in the GDR of operational-tactical missiles with a range of some 1,000 km also will become superfluous.

The number of initiatives on arms limitation and disarmament that are born and formulated in Europe is great. They include, for instance, the joint SED and SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] proposal on creating a zone free from chemical weapons in Europe, and -- developing an idea put forward by Olof Palme -- on creating a nuclear weapon-free corridor in Central Europe.

The response with which these initiatives are met beyond the borders of Europe reinforces the peace-loving forces' conviction that what was almost agreed on in Reykjavik could become a reality.

A difficult struggle lies ahead until the forces of reason and realism secure a final victory over the forces that threaten mankind. Every effort must be made to achieve our goals; but there is no easy path. Aggressive imperialist forces must be curbed, and this is possible.

Two important prerequisites exist for this. The first is the all-around qualitative reinforcement and increase in the might and internationally attractive force of socialism, thanks to the increasingly full revelation of its advantages. Here, in Leninist fashion, we consider it necessary, as Comrade E. Honecker has said, "to increase political vigilance with regard to imperialism's military preparations, with regard to the subversive actions of the enemies of peace and socialism, and with regard to the psychological war they are waging." The second prerequisite is the powerfully developing movement and collaboration of peace supporters from various forces and states which differ politically and socially and which form a broad coalition of reason and realism.

The SED and the people of the GDR are taking part in resolving this noble task, and we are confident that we will resolve it with honor.

SILAYEV, CSSR'S GERLE DISCUSS ENGINEERING

LD030021 Prague CTK in English 2021 GMT 2 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow Feb 2 (CTK correspondent) -- Czechoslovak Deputy Premier Ladislav Gerle met here today with Deputy Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers and Chairman of its bureau for engineering Ivan Silayev for talks on Czechoslovak-Soviet cooperation in engineering and the possibilities of its further extension.

They also discussed bilateral cooperation of the two countries in nuclear power engineering.

Ladislav Gerle was acquainted with experience from restructuring of the economic mechanism of the engineering complex in the Soviet Union and the results of its technical modernization and reconstruction.

Later in the day, Ladislav Gerle discussed with Soviet Deputy Premier Gennady Vedernikov cooperation between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union in metallurgy.

They paid special attention to the share of Czechoslovak engineering in the implementation of tasks connected with technical modernization and reconstruction of the Soviet metallurgical industry.

KATUSHEV MEETS WITH CSSR TRADE MINISTER

LD030018 Prague CTK in English 1940 GMT 2 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow Feb 2 (CTK correspondent) -- Czechoslovak Foreign Trade Minister Bohumil Urban, who is on a working visit to the Soviet Union, and Chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Economic Relations With Foreign Countries Konstantin Katushev discussed here today tasks concerning the extension of Czechoslovak-Soviet economic cooperation.

They put emphasis on the possibilities of Czechoslovak-Soviet cooperation on third markets and discussed also other topical questions of mutual interest.

'DYNAMIC DEVELOPMENT' IN SOVIET-ITALIAN TRADE

LD312001 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0600 GMT 31 Jan 87

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan (TASS) -- Next week Salvatore Formica, Italian minister for foreign trade, will arrive in the Soviet Union on a visit. A meeting with Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Boris Aristov is planned, during which an extensive exchange of opinions over the questions of the future development of foreign trade links between the two countries will take place.

Traditionally, Italy occupies one of the leading positions in the Soviet trade with industrially-developed capitalist countries. Almost 2.5 percent of the Soviet Union's trade turnover constitutes its contribution. In its turn, the USSR contributes 3 percent to the Italian trade. The economic cooperation between the two countries has a solid legal base. First of all, there are the trade and navigation treaty of 1948, providing for most-favored-nation status; a 1974 agreement which was extended in 1984 until the end of the current 5 years and concerns the development of economic, industrial and technical cooperation; and other documents.

The existence of such a base and common striving for the extension and strengthening of the mutually profitable trade-economic links help maintain trade at a high level. Today Italy is in third place, after the GDR and Finland, with regard to the volume of trade turnover among the USSR's West European partners. [sentence as received] In the 1981-85 period, the trade turnover reached R20.2 billion; that is, the level of the preceeding 5 years (R10.8 billion) nearly doubled.

The dynamic development of Soviet-Italian trade is also assisted by the fact that over 1,000 firms and organizations of the Apennine Peninsula are involved. Part from small and medium-sized companies, large companies such as "Montedison," "Fiat," "Pirelli," "Olivetti," and "Fata" participate in the trade. Many of them have long-term agreements with their Soviet partners; for example; the supply of Soviet natural gas for the period from 2000-2008 (ENI company) and the supply to the USSR of up to 900,000 metric tons of various rolled stock and pipes a year, (Finsider).

Soviet-Italian trade is implemented according to a broad range of goods. On the Soviet side, supplies of power sources -- gasoline, petroleum products, and natural gas predominate. Also, scrap metal, lumber, metal-cutting and forge-pressing equipment, electrotechnical and metallurgical equipment, and chemical and other goods are supplied.

On the list of Italian supplies to the USSR, a significant part is taken up by machine-building goods -- sets of equipment for automobile, metallurgical, food and other industries, metal-cutting machines and measuring instruments. Italian firms supply to the USSR consumer goods as well as rolled ferrous metal, chemical and other goods.

In recent years, in the trade balance between the two countries, the USSR has enjoyed a favorable balance. However, last year, according to evaluations, mutual trade was practically balanced. This can be explained to a certain extent by the drop in world prices for power sources. But the main reason for change in the trade balance is a sharp increase in Soviet imports. Under these conditions, it is logical to expect a further development in mutual trade.

ITALIAN TRADE MINISTER FORMICA OFFICIAL VISIT

Formica, Aristov Hold Talks

LD030014 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 2 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS -- The USSR foreign trade minister, Boris Aristov, and his Italian counterpart, Salvatore Formica, started talks here today to discuss the state of the prospects for Soviet-Italian trade and economic cooperation.

They examined concrete measures aimed at preserving and extending the attained level of Soviet-Italian trade.

The ministers paid much attention to new forms of trade and economic cooperation between Soviet ministries, departments, agencies and enterprises and Italian firms and companies.

The talks will continue.

Italy 'Important' Partner

AU031117 Rome ANSA in English 1000 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] (ANSA) Moscow, February -- Recent changes in the regulations governing trade with foreign countries and involvement in the private sector have brought about a "great interest" in Soviet trade circles in trade with Italy, Soviet Trade Minister Boris Aristov told his Italian counterpart Rino Formica here yesterday, as Formica began his three day visit to the Soviet Union.

In a special feature marking the visit of the Italian minister, the Soviet news agency TASS said that trade relations between the two countries were based "on solid legal foundations," being covered by the 1974 agreement on cooperation for economic, industrial and technological development.

Italy is the third most important Western trading partner of the Soviet Union, following West Germany and Finland. Exports to Italy represent 2.5 percent of total Soviet trade, while Italy's to the Soviet Union represented 3 percent of all foreign trade. During the five year period 1981/5 the value of trade rose to 34 billion rubles, almost double that of the previous five years.

Today, Formica is to visit the fourth biennial "Agritalia" trade fair, which was visited recently by Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Ryzhkov Receives Formica

LD031621 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov today received Italy's Minister of Foreign Trade Salvatore Formica, now on a visit in Moscow.

Both sides expressed satisfaction with the development of a Soviet-Italian political dialogue which suits the interests of consolidating confidence and improving the situation in Europe and in the whole world.

Nikolay Ryzhkov emphasised that the course at speeding up the country's social and economic development adopted by the Soviet Union and confirmed by the January plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee attests convincingly to a peaceful direction of the Soviet Union's plans, to the Soviet Union's striving to put an end to the arms race, to remove the threat of nuclear conflict.

It was noted that reorganisation being implemented in the USSR, which applies also to the activity in the sphere of external economic relations, opens new opportunities for the development of mutually advantageous economic cooperation between Soviet Organisations and Italian firms with the use both of traditional ties and new forms of interaction, including cooperation in production and the setting up of joint enterprises.

Salvatore Formica, noting a lively interest in Italy to the transformations in various areas of the social and economic life taking place in the Soviet Union, declared for the widening of Soviet-Italian economic ties on a basis of mutual advantage.

The conversation passed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Vladimir Kamentsev, USSR Minister of Foreign Trade Boris Aristov, as well as Italy's Ambassador to the USSR Sergio Romano took part in the conversation.

Joint Venture Protocol Signed

LD032348 Moscow TASS in English 1921 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- A protocol of intentions providing for the creation in the USSR of a Soviet-Italian joint venture has been signed today by the USSR Ministry of Machine-Building for the Light and Food Industries and Household Appliances and the Italian firm Fata.

The parties to the joint venture in the city of Volzhsk will be the Soviet amalgamation "Volzhskprodmash" and the Italian firm "Fata."

As TASS was told by Gaetano di Rosa, the president of the firm Fata, plant will employ a personnel of 2,500 men. It will manufacture various refrigerators and cold-storage equipment for trade and public catering enterprises worth 500 million dollars a year.

A considerable part of the products is to be exported to the countries of South-East Asia, Africa and even the USA. Fata is to supply the works with the necessary equipment, technology and know-how. In the course of two months the partners are to endorse the rules to form the board of directors and sign framework contracts for the purchase of equipment, spares and raw materials.

If the project is implemented, the joint venture may become the first major industrial plant to be built in the USSR jointly with Western firms and oriented towards export of its products. It will start manufacturing refigerator equipment for shops, and in June of the same year the export of equipment is to be started.

Fata is known in the Soviet market as a supplier of unitized equipment for the food, chemical and other industries. Last year was for the firm a record one as regards the volume of contracts in the Soviet market. The sum total of the contracts signed was 140 million dollars, the president of the firm said.

MOSCOW TV ASSESSES FRENCH-SOVIET ECONOMIC MEETING

LD242344 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 24 Jan 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; a Potopov report]

[Text] The latest session of the Soviet-French Intergovernmental Commission on Scientific and Technical and Economic Cooperation has been held in Paris. Great experience of cooperation has been accumulated. The experience of fruitful and stable contacts has been acquired. At the present session, the businesslike discussion is in a spirit of frankness and directness. There is cause for concern. After all, trade turnover between the two countries declined last year by almost one-third. Michel Noir, the French minister of foreign trade, is concerned with the shortfall in trade between France and the USSR. Comrade Aristov, the Soviet minister of foreign trade, recalls that the sharp fall in the price of oil on the world market had an impact on the volume of trade turnover, too.

However, the cause of the imbalance in trade is mainly to be found in that the French side is artificially restricting deliveries of machines and equipment and advanced technology to the Soviet Union and is also holding back Soviet exports. During the session, when the Soviet delegation met French businessmen, they were curious to know why Soviet orders for industrial equipment presently are being placed more in other Western countries than in France. The reason is the same: restrictive measures. French exporters have lost about 20 billion francs because of this attitude toward Soviet requests. Now French industrialists are very interested in a reform of our external economic contacts in setting up joint enterprises in the Soviet Union with the involvement of capital from Western countries.

The big commission is a significant event and the head of the Soviet delegation was received by French President Mitterrand. During a conservation, the importance of economic cooperation — the foundation of Soviet-French relations as a whole -- was emphasized. The intention of both countries to make further efforts toward deepening trade and scientific and technical ties was the subject of a conservation with French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac. [video shows Mitterrand greeting officials, Chirac speaking with them]

And here is the final document of the session. [video shows Potapov and documents] A detailed analysis is given of the state and prospects of cooperation. The importance of scientific and technical cooperation developing into industrial and economic cooperation is stressed. Satisfaction is expressed with progress made in preparing for a joint space flight. Measures for the development of mutual trade on a balanced basis are discussed. Indeed, the possibilities for developing bilateral ties are broad and realistic. It is not for nothing that in the bulky final document, the prospects for exchanges in machine-building power engineering, agriculture, transportation, and many other fields are examined in detail. This is the conclusion: There are difficulties; nobody is concealing them. The main thing now is that work needs to be done. Work must be done on the basis of equality, and taking account of mutual interests -- work in the name of consolidating friendly ties between our two countries.

W. EUROPE POLITICAL PENDULUM SWINGING TO CENTER

LD022342 Moscow Television Service in Russin 1500 GMT 1 Feb 87

[From "The International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] People are thinking and considering in different ways, of course, but this is natural. On the whole, I think that for European countries it is difficult to find a common denominator, but one gets the impression that the political pendulum in Western Europe is swinging toward the center. There is a movement from the right toward the center. This is shown by the results of the recent elections in West Germany where the ruling coalition achieved very modest results; this is shown by the intention of the British Conservatives to hold early Parliament elections. They eagerly feel that the position of the Tories is weakening and they want to receive the mandate of the electors for another term of government.

Other facts of the political life of present-day Europe precisely show a shift to the center by the political pendulum. Reaganomics, which they used to worship, is on the wane. What cured them of that was not just mass unemployment in the United States and Western Europe; the economic difficulties now being experienced by the United States has also been a cure for that -- the sharp fall in the dollar, the giant budget deficit, and the rise in the internal debt. Overall, hardly anyone believes in Reaganomics anymore, and it is noted that in the economic sphere Western Europe is acting more and more independently. In the political sphere this independence is more modest, although here too there are a few modest -- at first sight hardly noticeable -- movements, but this too alarms the United States.

US.-SPANISH 'DEADLOCKED TALKS' ON BASES CONTINUE

LD032200 Moscow TASS in English 2145 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Madrid February 3 TASS -- TASS correspondent Robert Serebrennikov reports:

The fourth round of the deadlocked American-Spanish talks on the reduction of U.S. military presence in that country started today in Madrid. The previous rounds of the difficult dialogue about the future of U.S. military bases did not bring any concrete results.

This situation was brought about by the obstructionist policy of Washington which is procrastinating the discussion of the essence of this problem under various pretexts and is seeking just a symbolic reduction of the U.S. military personnel. The U.S. has not responded so far to the document put forward by Spain during the first round of talks which set the scope and schedule of the reduction of the U.S. troops stationed in that country.

Moreover, according to the Spanish press, Washington continues to reinforce its naval base in Rota, near Cadiz, thus turning it into the biggest stronghold of the Pentagon in the Mediterranean region.

These U.S. actions are evoking the growing discontent of the Spanish Government. In the course of the referendum it pledged to reduce U.S. military presence, making it one of the main conditions of retaining NATO membership. The stand of Madrid which described the question of U.S. military bases as a problem connected with national sovereignty is as follows: Either Washinton will agree to a substantial reduction of its military contingent, or the Spanish-American agreement on friendship, defense and cooperation which expires in 1988 will be canceled.

MOSCOW DEPLORES U.S. MILITARY ACTIONS IN CYPRUS

LD310016 Moscow in Greek to Greece 1730 GMT 28 Jan 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] U.S. and British warships have appeared off Cyprus. This is being reported virtually every hour by the news agencies. The newspaper APOYEVMATINI reports that the British naval [as heard] base at Akrotiri has already been put on combat readiness. U.S. F-111 bombers have landed at this base.

These dangerous activities are par for the already tested NATO course. In September 1986, French paratroops and other special units were getting familiarization training at the British war bases in Cyprus. At the same time, according to the Cyprus press, U.S. troops were being transferred to Akrotiri from West Germany and Turkey. Newspapers at the time drew the conclusion that a coordinated attack against Lebanon was being prepared by the Armed Forces amassed at Akrotiri and the warships of the U.S. 6th Fleet.

Events again are unfolding in accordance with the very well-known scenario. The British war bases on the island have been put on combat readiness; warships from the U.S. 6th Fleet are congregating off Cyprus; the fortunes of the Cypriot people again depend on U.S.-NATO adventurism with which the Republic of Cyprus has absolutely no connection.

I don't know whether the Cypriots themselves accept the argument that the United States has a great need for its Near and Middle East armed operations of landings and take-offs on airstrips on the territories of the nonaligned countries. I don't think so. There is a total contradiction between the national security interests of Cyprus and the U.S. militaist preparations in the area. In any event, Washington does not deem it necessary to give explanations. The United States simply acts, using the hospitable sovereignty of the British war bases in Cyprus to achieve its military-strategic aims. Its acts force the Cypriots to wonder: In which direction will the U.S. F-11 bombers fly tomorrow? Or maybe today? Or even at this very moment? Where will they take their death cargo? What will the consequences be for the inhabitants of the small island, which the United Statesa and NATO try persistently to attach to their adventurism? Worrying questions.

PRAVDA VIEWS U.S. BUILDING OF THULE RADAR STATION

PM301618 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 7 First Edition p 5

[Mikhail Kostikov "Commentator's Column": "In the Role of Underlings"]

[Text] Copenhagen -- The Pentagon is speeding up the creation of a sophisticated radar installation at the base at Thule in the extreme northwest of Greenland. [paragraph continues]

This base has long been used by the American military not only as a bridgehead for electronic espionage against the USSR and for the collection of intelligence information from satellites, but also as a center for planned nuclear missile operations in the north. Now they want to adapt it for the control of combat operations in outer space.

The siting of the new radar installation at the Thule base, the capital's POLITIKEN newspaper notes, citing information from a whole series of American and British arms control exports, undermines the 1972 Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty and is closely connected to the "Star Wars" plans. As the Western press reports, a similar radar station is also being created in the Fylingdales region (Britain).

As for Denmark (Greenland forms part of Denmark on the basis of international autonomy), such plans on Washington's part go against Copenhagen's official position. After all, according to a decision of the Folketing (parliament), in all international forums, including NATO, the government is obliged to come out against the "Star Wars" plans and space militarization in general, and for the need for strict compliance with the ABM Treaty. It is this contradiction that is the crux of the parliamentary question put recently by the Social Democratic faction together with other left-wing opposition parties to Foreign Minister U. Ellemann-Jensen. And although the question was really to the point, no answer has yet been received.

Greenland, which was farmed out to the Pentagon virtually by way of Denmark's "contribution" to NATO, is being turned into a major militarist bridgehead by the U.S. military. In the hands of the United States, it is becoming one of the main instruments for undermining the very foundations of Danish military policy and policy in the security sphere. This is being done blatantly behind the backs of the Danes, whose opinion Washington does not intend to reckon with; the building of the new radar installation is further confirmation of this. It will, in effect, place Denmark in the position of accomplice in the preparations for "Star Wars," of Pentagon's underling in undermining the foundations of the ABM Treaty.

ICELAND'S NEED FOR INTELLEGENCE SERVICE QUESTIONED

PM031159 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jan 87 First Edition p 3

[O. Vakulovskiy article: "Who Needs This?"]

[Text] Let's admit it, the Swedish news agency's report that Iceland intends to set up an intelligence and counterintelligence service is surprising. It is difficult to believe that such an idea could occur to the Icelanders when they do not even have their own army. Or perhaps U.S. and British movies about spies have had such an influence on the island's inhabitants that they themselves have suddenly decided to create their own "national super-heroes" in the style of James Bond? It is impossible to imagine another reason for the Icelanders' sudden need to be concerned about an intelligence service.

What is going on? As for Icelanders themselves they really have no need for special services. The very idea of creating an "Icelandic intelligence service" is not theirs; the idea is imported. This has happened several times in the island's history when its population was made to take action that was not only unnecessary but even greatly damaged national interests.

During World War II, the Americans appeared in Iceland. After the war they did not wish to leave, and, by fair but mainly foul means, they consolidated their hold on the military base at Keflavik. Then they started to draw the country into the orbit of their military activity and, using the myth of the "Soviet military threat" against the North Atlantic, enticed them into the NATO bloc.

The Pentagon is not inclined to ask for Reykjavik's consent to its activity on the island, as the U.S.-Icelandic accords foresee. Until now representatives of the Icelandic Government have not had access to the U.S. Air Force base at Keflavik. Specialists do not rule out the presence of nuclear weapon elements at the base. It is well known that the base's military personnel are trained in the use of nuclear weapaons. In Iceland they well remember how this country's government, so they say, only found out from the newspapers that the United States planned to site depth charges with nuclear charges at Keflavic. These plans were frustrated. However, how would events have developed if an information leak about this scandalous plan had not occurred?

Now they are persuading the Icelanders of the "need" to have their own intelligence service. The official reason is Iceland's recent inclusion in the North Atlantic bloc military orgainzation. Now they say they cannot do without a spy department.

Why does Iceland need one? The most important task of NATO hearquarters consists not only of getting hold of yet another "subsidiary' in the system of spy services; it is not by accident that NATO representatives have started particularly actively to juggle with the traditional thesis of the "Soviet threat to Iceland," The "Soviet Union's heightened interest in the island," and so on. As yet only in the plans of the existing intelligence service is the activity's general direction set well in advance. [sentence as published] Evidently, someone really wants to create an additional instrument for psychological operations against the Soviet Union and fuel anti-Soviet hysteria in Iceland, which has traditionally had friendly relations with our country.

Those who thought up the "Icelandic intelligence service" wanted Iceland to be even more tightly bound to a policy which is thrust upon it from without -- from the Pentagon and from NATO headquarters in Brussels. For progressive mankind, Reykjaavik has become the symbol of hope -- hope for dialogue and mutual understanding -- which can ultimately lead to the beginning of the disarmament process. For the Pentagon and NATO headquarters, Reykjavik remains the island's capital, very convenient from the strategic viewpoint and very convenient for technical support for aggression against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Pentagon did not intend to abandon such plans either before or after Reykjavik.

BRIEFS

BRITISH SCIENTIFIC, CULTURAL AGREEMENT -- London, 18 Jan (TASS) -- A Soviet-British intergovernmental agreement on relations in science, education, and culture for 1987-89 has been signed. Vsevolod Sofinskiy, first deputy head of a directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, signed the agreement for the Soviet side. Timothy Eggar, British parliamentary under secretary of state at the Foreign Office signed it for the British side. The agreement envisages the expansion of contacts in these areas. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0810 GMT 18 Jan 87 LD]

CPSU GREETINGS TO MOZAMBIQUE'S FRELIMO PARTY

PM031219 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 87 First Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee greetings message to Mozambique Liberation Front on its anniversary]

[Text] To the Mozambique Liberation Front [Frelimo] Party Central Committee:

Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee cordially congratulates you on the Frelimo Party's 10th anniversary.

The creation of the Frelimo Party was a very important event in Mozambique's history and marked a new stage in its people's struggle for independence and progress. During these years the Mozambican working people have achieved weighty results under the Frelimo Party's leadership in eliminating the consequences of colonialism and in implementing political and socioeconomic transformations.

Your young republic's creative work is being carried out in a complex international situation. Imperialist circles headed by the United States are trying to halt the process of progressive change in the world. In southern Africa, just as everywhere, they are seeking to crush the forces of national and social liberation. The aggressive actions of the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa and its agents, who are seeking to deprive your people of the right to follow their chosen path and to eliminate the sovereign Mozambican state, are a constituent part of this policy.

Together with the other Frontline States, Mozambique is courageously countering the intrigues of imperialist and racist forces in the south of the African continent. The fortitude of the Mozambican people and their party in defending the revolutionary gains and your country's peace-loving foreign policy course have won deserved respect in the world. Communists and the entire Soviet people express their international solidarity to you, dear comrades.

Relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Mozambique are developing on the firm foundation of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between out countries. Our friendship is founded on the fraternal ties between the CPSU and the Frelimo Party. Permit us to express confidence that time-tested Soviet-Mozambican cooperation will continue to strengthen and develop in all spheres.

On this portentious day for the people of Mozambique and the Frelimo Party we wish you, dear comrades, further successes in labor and struggle.

The CPSU Central Committee.

CORRECTION TO TASS REPORT ON MACHEL PLANE CRASH

The following correction pertains to the iten headlined "Machel Plane Crash Result of 'Sabotage,'" published in the 2 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page J 1, paragraph one, line two:

...destruction of the plane of Mozambican President Samora Machel leave no doubt that it...(changing word "to" to "no")

PARAGUAYAN CP MEMBER CITES WORKERS' REPRESSION

PY220036 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 0000 GMT 20 Jan 87

[*Interview with Ananias Maidana, member of the Paraguayan Communist Party, by unidentified reporter; date, place not given -- recorded*]

[Excerpts] [Reporter] Comrade Ananias Maidana, it has been reported that the fascist dictatorship of General Alfredo Stroessner has unleashed a new repressive action against the workers of the Yacyreta Dam project. What can you tell us about this?

[Maidana] It is well-known that the Paraguayan and Argentine workers of the Yacyreta dam project have for a long time been demanding the just enforcement of the legal 8-hour work day and the right to organize themselves into unions. [Words indistinct] intimidation and threats for their economic and social claims they have been the victims of a brutal attack by the dictatorship. When thousands of Paraguayan and Argentine workers were on their way to the Argentine side to hold an assembly, Stroessner's police and Army personnel blocked their way and attacked them with the butts of their rifles and tear gas.

[Reporter] What was the outcome of that repressive measure?

[Maidana] As a result of this unjustified and criminal attack, several Argentine and Paraguayan workers were injured and some of them had to be hospitalized. In addition to that, the police arrested many workers and then transferred them to jail in Asuncion. [passage omitted]

[Reporter] What was the reaction of the Yacyreta workers?

[Maidana] In response to the Stroessner dictatorship and in defense of their legitimate rights, the workers of the binational Paraguayan-Argentine Yacyreta project held on that occasion a forceful assembly with the participation of over 3,000 workers. They made the following decisions: To remain in a state of permanent mobilization, to work only the regular hours in accordance with the contract, and to demand the immediate release of the workers under arrest and the return of the 40 workers who were dismissed on the Argentine side. The Paraguayan workers, through their delegates in the assembly, stated that they are not going to work until they get sufficient guarantees and until their right for free union organization is recognized.

The Central Committee of the Paraguayan Communist Party released a communique expressing its strong repudiation of this barbaric act and its full support for the claims of the Yacyreta workers. The party also demanded the release of all workers under arrest and the return of the workers who were dismissed. We call on all the antidictatorial democratic forces and all the workers to express their support for the struggle of the Yacyreta workers.

PAPER CARRIES 'THESES' OF GORBACHEV PLENUM REPORT

PM281225 KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jan 87 pp 1-2

[Unattributed article: "On Restructuring and the Party's Cadres Policy"]

[Text] The plenary meeting has on its agenda matter of paramount importance to the effective fulfillment of the political strategy drafted by the April 1985 plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the 27th CPSU Congress, the question of reorganization and the party's personnel policy. It is considered in a broad social and political context, with due regard for the lessons of the past, the nature of the present time and the tasks to come.

As in generally known, the April plenary meeting and the 27th Party congress prepared the ground for an objective critical analysis of the situation in society and took decisions of historic importance for the country's future. The society has begun reorganization and it will not look back. The first steps on that road have been taken.

The first political conclusion is that major changes are taking place in the life of Soviet society and that positive tendencies are gaining momentum.

The policy line of the 27th Congress, the party's practical efforts to fulfill it and reorganization itself have been given broad support by workers, by the Soviet people.

At the same time, change for the better is taking place slowly, the cause of reorganization is more difficult and the problems which have accumulated in society more deep-rooted than was first thought.

That is why there is a need to return to an analysis of those problems which confronted the party and Soviet society in the few years preceding the April 1985 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, to understand the reasons for negative processes and to work our measures to speed up our progress, to keep us from repeating mistakes.

I

Almost seven decades ago the Leninist party raised over the country the victorious banner of socialist revolution.

The achievements of the Soviet people along the path of socialist transformations are immense and indubitable. But no accomplishments, even the most impressive, should obscure either contradictions in societal development or our mistakes and failings.

At some point the country began to lose momentum, difficulties and unresolved problems started to pile up, and there appeared elements of stagnation and other phenomena alien to socialism.

Of course, the country did not cease developing. Tens of millions of Soviet people were working honestly and many party organizations and our cadre workers were energetically acting in the interests of the people. All that held back the negative processes but could not avert them altogether.

The report draws the conclusion that in the recent past, conservative sentiments, inertia, a tendency to brush aside anything that did not fit into conventional patterns prevailed in policy-making and practical work.

The extent to which vital problems and contradictions were understood depended in many ways on the condition and progress of theory.

Lenin's dictum that the value of a theory consists in its providing an exact picture "of all the contradictions that are present in reality" was often merely ignored. The theoretical concepts of socialism remained to a large extent at the level of the 1930s-40s, when society had been tackling entirely different tasks, developing socialism, the dialectics of its motive forces and contradictions and the actual conditions of society did not become the subject of in-depth scientific research.

Lenin's ideas of socialism were interpreted simplistically and their theoretical depth and significance were often left emaciated. This was true of such key problems as public property, relations between classes and nationalities, the measure of work and measure of consumption, cooperation, methods of economic management, people's rule and self-government and others.

Spurious notions of communism and various prophecies and abstract views gained currency.

The situation on the theoretical front had a negative effect on the solution of practical questions. Obsolete methods were preserved for decades on end in the practice of economic management and administration while, in contrast, some efficient economic forms were groundlessly rejected. Production and incentive were actually oriented to quantitative, extensive growth.

Control over who managed socialist property and how had been seriously slackened. It was often eroded by departmental and parochial attitudes and became "no one's," free, without any real master, and in many cases came to be used to derive unearned income. There was an incorrect attitude to cooperative property, which had grievous consequences for agrarian and social policies.

Preconceptions about the role of monetary-commodity relations and the operation of the law of value and sometimes their being set in direct opposition to socialism as something alien led to voluntarist approaches in the economy, the underestimation of cost-accounting, "levelling out in pay" and bred subjective approaches in price formation, breaches of money circulation and disregard for the regulations of supply and demand.

Restrictions on the cost-accounting rights of enterprises and amalgamations had especially grave consequences. They subverted the foundations of material incentive, blocked the achievement of high end results, and led to a lowering of the people's labor and social activity and to a slackening of discipline and order.

In fact, a whole system of weakening the economic tools of government emerged and there took shape a mechanism of slowing down socio-economic development and hindering the progressive transformations which made it possible to tap and use the advantages of socialism. That braking proess was rooted in serious shortcomings in the functioning of the institutes of socialist democracy, outdated political and theoretical concepts that often did not correspond to meet reality, and conservative managerial machinery.

All that adversely affected the development of many areas in the life of society. Since the early seventies, the plans for most indicators in material production were not fulfilled during the last three 5-year plan periods. The economy as a whole became cumbersome and unreceptive to innovation. The growth rates of the national income in material production in the past three five-year plan periods dropped by more than half. More plan targets were not met since the early 1970s.

The economy as a whole became cumbersome and relatively receptive to innovation. The quality of a considerable part of output no longer met the current requirements, and imbalances in production became aggravated. Negative processes seriously affected the social area.

Having successfully resolved the question of employment and having provided social guarantees, we at the same time failed to realize in full the potential of socialism to improve housing conditions, food supply, transport, health care and education and the solution of a number of other vital problems.

There emerged violations of the most important principle of socialism, distribution according to work. Efforts to control unearned income were indecisive. Parastic sentiments grew stronger and the mentality of "wage levelling" began to take hold.

Elements of social corrosion that emerged in the past few years had a negative effect on the society's morale and inconspicuously eroded the lofty moral values which have always been characteristic of our people and of which we are proud, namely, ideological dedication, labour enthusiasm and Soviet patriotism.

As an inevitable consequence of all this, interest in the affairs of society slackened,ymanifestations of callousness and septicism appeared and the role of moral incentive to work declined.

Serious shortcomings in ideological and political education were in many cases disguised with ostentatious activities and campaigns and celebrations of numerous jubilees in the centre and in the provinces. The world of day-to-day realities and that of make-believe well-being were increasingly parting ways.

Disregard for laws, report-padding, bribe-taking and encouragement of toadyism and adulation had a deleterious influence on the moral atmosphere in society.

The ideology and mentality of stagnation had their effect on culture, literature and the arts. Criteria in appraising artistic creative work were reduced. [paragraph continues]

As a consequence, there appeared quite a few mediocre, faceless works, which did not give anything to the mind or the heart, along with workds which raised serious social and moral problems and reflected true-to-live collisions.

With all the tremendous work done by the party, its cadres, the leading party bodies nevertheless failed to make a timely and critical appraisal of the danger of the growth of negative tendencies in society and in the conduct of a section of the Communists and to take decisions which were imperatively demanded by practice.

Far from all party organizations managed to remain on positions of principle, wage a resolute fight against negative phenomena, permissiveness, mutual protection, the slackening of discipline and the spread of drunkenness. Departmentalism, parochialism and manifestations of nationalism were not always properly rebuffed.

The principles of collective leadership were being violated, the role of party meetings and elective bodies were being weakened. Many party members in senior executive positions were beyond control or criticism. The guarantees of the purity or party ranks incorporated in the party rules were not effective.

Everything said above shows how serious the situation was in different areas of society and how strong the need for deep changes was.

It was in that situation, that the question of speeding up the socio-economic development of the country and the question of reorganization was raised. In essence, we are actually talking about a turning-point and measures of a revolutionary character.

We simply don't have any other choice. We must not retreat and do not have anywhere to retreat to. We must steer the right course charted by the April plenum of the Central Committee and the 27th congress consistently and unswervingly we must advance and take society to a qualitatively new level of development.

The Political Bureau is of the view that restructuring means resolutely overcoming stagnatory processes, dismantling the braking mechanism, creating a reliable and effective mechanism of accelerating Soviet society's social and economic development. The main idea of our strategy is to merge the achievements of the scientific and tecnological revolution with the planned economy and to bring into play socialims's entire potential.

The ultimate aim of restructuring is the profound renovation of all aspects of the country's life, giving socialism the most modern forms of social organization, the fullest possible implementation of the humanistic nature of our system in all of its decisive aspects -- economic, socio-political and moral.

Today reorganization is being pursued along the entire front. It is acquiring a new quality -- it is being pursued not only in width but is also penetrating into deep-lying strata of life. A new moral atmosphere is taking shape in the country, there is a reassessment of values, while openness, truthfulness in the evaluation of phenomena ane events, implacability to shortcomings, desire to improve matters are becoming asserted as vigorously acting principles. Exactingness, discipline, and organization have been enchanced, and there is more order in production.

Work has begun to radically transform the material and technical base, to achieve a profound reconstruction of the national economy on the basis of scientific and technological progress, changes have been made in the structural and investment policy. Major measures are being taken to improve administration, the mechanism of management. New principles of raising wages have been worked out and are being implemented. Unjustified restrictions on individual labor have been lifted. And the organization of cooperatives in various areas of production and services is being encouraged.

The report analyzes the results of the fulfilment of the plan of economic and social development in the 1st year of the 5-year-plan period. It is stressed that today, when the restructuring is still in its initial stage, it is especially important to keep to positions of realism, of an objective assessment of what has been done, to view the results of work not only from positions of the past but, most important, proceeding from the plans announced by the party and the promises made. This is the only correct party approach.

While being of a high opinion of the party's course of reorganization Soviet peole express at the same time concern over the way it is being implemented in practice. They call on the party not to stop, to act with resolve, to advance and steadily pursue the adopted course. Political conclusions should be drawn from this.

An analysis of the state of affairs and the experience of restructuring give utmost urgency to the most important question -- do we have guarantees that the process of transformations will be carried out to the end, that former mistakes will not be repeated and that we will be able to ensure the full-blooded development of our society?

We do have such guarantees. They are the common will, the concerted actions of the party and the people united by past experience and awareness of their responsibility for the socialist homeland's present and future. They are the Soviet people, their commitment to socialism. They are our Leninist party with its tremendous creative potential. But we cannot regard these guarantees as something that acts independently of us and under all circumstances, so to speak automatically. The Political Bureau links them with the still fuller exposure and utilization of the deep-lying possibilities of socialism as a new social system and, most important, with the all-round development of socialist democratism, the real participation of the popular masses in solving all questions of society's life.

II.

The socialist system has given the working people truly wide political and socio-economic rights and individual freedoms and proved in fact the great advantages of Soviet democracy. But an accelerated onward movement today is possible only in conditions of the maximum activization of the human factor and the further development of democratic forms characteristic of socialism. Therein lies the essence of the party's policy of deepening the socialist self-government of the people.

We have started this process. All areas in the life of society are being democratized. The life of party organizations is becoming more full-blooded, publicity, criticism and self-criticism are broadening, mass information media are becoming more active and new public organizations are being set up. There is increased participation by working people in public affairs, in running the country.

The party approaches democratization of Soviet society and personnel policy from broad positions, having in view all sections of our political system and all component parts of administration and the economic mechanism.

Of primary importance is the development of democracy at the point of production and the consistent introduction of truly self-governing principles. It is necessary to create such conditions and to introduce such forms of organization of production and of the life of work collectives that would give every worker a sense of being the true master of his plant.

The tasks of effective use of all forms of direct democracy will be defined in a law on state enterprise (amalgamation) of which a draft is to be submitted for nation-wide discussion.

Giving general meetings and councils of work collectives decisive powers on matters pertaining to production, social and personnel issues, which are envisaged by the draft, will lead to the qualitative perfection of social relations.

The collective farms and socialist cooperation as a whole have broad possibilities for democratizing the processes of management of the economy and the social area. The promising steps already undertaken in many republics, territories and regions to broaden the cooperative forms of activities deserve support.

The crucial issue of the development of democracy in production is the introduction of the system of electing heads of enterprises, shops and departments, heads of sections, farms and units, production team leaders and foremen. Transition to new methods of economic management, economic cost accounting, self-financing and self-repayment put that task on a practical plane.

The democratization of the process of forming the managerial personnel on the basis of the application of the principle of electivity everywhere signals a new step forward and lends a fundamentally new character to the participation of the working people in production management. Party and public organizations and economic management organs are placed in new conditions. The electivity of senior executives in production far from undermining, on the contrary strengthens one-man management. An organic combination of one-man command and collegiality deepens and develops Lenin's principles of democratic centralism and centralized planned guidance with reliance of the collective, on the masses.

The Political Bureau considers the perfection of the election system to be a fundamental trend in democratization.

Its existing mechanism ensures the democratic formation and representation of all sections of the population in the soviets. But in common with all political, economic and social institutions, the election system cannot be left unchanged, it cannot stand aloof from the processes linked with reorganization. The task is to give the elector the opportunity to express his or her attitude to a larger number of candidates, to rid the voting procedure of a number of elements of formalism.

The broadening of innerparty democracy, above all in forming the leading bodies of party organizations at all levels, is becoming increasingly topical. The report contains specific proposals on that issue.

The democratization of society poses afresh the question of control over how party, soviet and economic bodies and their cadres work. [paragraph continues]

Of great significance is to raise the level and effectiveness of control "from grassroots" so that every leader, every executive should permanently feel his responsibility to and dependence on the electors, the work collectives, public organizations, the party and the people as a whole. It is proposed to introduce systematic accountability of all executives who are elected and appointed, to strengthen the democratic principles of work on the sessions and standing commissions of the Soviets, to broaden public openness in the activities of government and public organizations, to streamline the system of various checks and inspections.

True democracy does not exist outside or above the law. In accordance with the directives of the 27th congress a large amount of work is to be done to draft and adopt new laws pertaining to the development of the economy and culture, socialist self-government, broadening of the rights and freedoms of citizens.

It is stressed that socialist democracy has nothing in common with permissiveness, anarchy and irresponsibility.

The effectiveness of genuine democracy depends on the extent of its social base, on the way the reserves and possibilities for its expansion are used. In this connection the report considers the issues of the young generation's participation in handling tasks of reorganization, of the promotion of non-party people and of women to leading posts.

Serious attention is given to national aspects of personnel policy. The successes of this policy are undeniable, but we ought to look at the real picture and the prospects for developing national relations in the country. The more so since negative phenomena and deformations with which we have started to deal have emerged in this area too. Party organizations are obliged to handle in a more profound way questions of developing national and international relations, questions of internationalist education. Any nationalist and chauvinistic trends can be successfully opposed only by consistent, sustained internationalism.

III

In formulating a personnel policy to match the tasks of reorganization, the Politburo of the Central Committee proceeds from the premise that its success will depend to a decisive extent on how fast and profound our cadres' perception will be of the need for changes, how constructive and purposeful their effort will be in implementing the party's policy.

The years of socialist construction in the country have seen the formation and constant replenishment of a powerful potential of highly skilled personnel. Everything that we have accomplished is the result of Soviet people's work and is due to our cadres' selfless effort. At the same time one should also mention at this plenum mistakes in our work with cadres, distortions in personnel policy that have occurred in recent years and resulted in major shortcomings in the activity of several links of the party, state and economic apparatus and in negative phenomena in society. In order to avoid such miscalculations in the future, we ought to draw lessons from the past.

The first one is the need to resolve in good time overripe personnel questions, to ensure continuity in the leadership and its constant renewal, including the CPSU Central Committee and the government. [paragraph continues]

Raising the question in this way corresponds to the Leninist understanding of personnel policy, to the interests of the party and the people. The report considers questions of the role of Central Committee members, their rights and responsibilities, the importance of enhancing the level of work of plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee, the need to discuss at them the most crucial problems in the life of the party and society as a whole.

The second lesson is not to allow any underestimation of political and theoretical training, of the ideological and moral tempering of cadres, of the importance of the earliest overcoming of technocratic style of work. In plunging into economic work and assuming in several instances functions not properly pertaining to the party, many party functionaries reduced attention to political issues, to phenomena of social significance in the area of the economy, in social and cultural life.

The third lesson is the fact that two opposite trends have co-existed in personnel policy in a paradoxical way over the past years: stagnation in the composition of the top echelons on the one hand, and unjustified, at times hasty replacement of heads of enterprises, construction projects, collective and state farms on the other.

We are for stability but is must not evolve into a lack of personnel turnover. We are for renewal but against the continual reshuffling of cadres. More consideration, concern, thought and principle must be shown in this work in the interests of the common cause.

The fourth lesson of our cadre work is that it is essential to increase one's accountability for the assigned task, tighten discipline, and foster an atmosphere of increased mutual exactingness. The situation must not be permitted, in which many senior posts remain filled for decades by people failing to cope with their duties. We should not and cannot be "kind" to the detriment of the interests of the party, society and people.

There is, finally, yet another lesson. It is that laxness in enforcing democratic principles, the belittling of the role of elected bodies in a number of cases, and serious inadequacies in the activities of control agencies in both the party and the state have for long been one of the reasons behind the serious deficiencies in our work with cadres.

There is an overriding need today to improve our personnel policy. It must be made really up-to-date, more active and purposeful and linked inseparably with the key tasks of the drive for faster social and economic development. Cadres' attitude to the process of re-organization, that is practical rather than verbal attitude, is the decisive yardstick of performance in cadre policy and acts as a kind of tuning fork. The moral qualities and competence of personnel, their high professional standards, irreconcilability to shortcomings, to red tape and to indifferent and passive attitudes, and their commitment to everything that is advanced and progressive have become immensely important in present-day conditions.

Further change in society means re-styling the work of the party and its cadres at every level -- from the Central Committee to the primary organizations. It means creatively absorbing and consistently applying the Leninist principles and norms of party life in every organization.

The report analyses the course of the restructuring in party organizations, and emphasises that the party committees and all party cadres should learn to work under conditions of deeper democracy and growing political and labor activity of the people. The report specially considers the question of restructuring the work of city and district committees of the party and primary party organizations. This is precisely the main arena of the drive for the implementation of the decisions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU.

An immense responsibility in this work rests with the economic personnel of enterprises, amalgamations, and managerial personnel. The transition from management by decree to economic methods of management, the expansion of the independence of enterprises and amalgamations, and the new approach to foreign trade activities put personnel in fundamentally new conditions. It is of importance to teach economic executives and specialists to use to the full their rights and resources. The increased orientation of the activity of personnel towards the social area acquires fundamental importance.

It is necessary to bring about reorganization of the work of ministries and departments as soon as possible, to help them throw away petty tutelage and interference in the day-to-day activities of amalgamations and enterprises, and to focus attention on matters concerning scientific and technological progress, the refinement of the economic mechanism, and on large-scale, long-term matters of the development of sectors. Tasks facing the personnel of planning, financial and other economic bodies have been singled out in view of the current radical reform of economic management.

The role of the soviets of people's deputies should be raised in practice and their responsibility for acceleration of socio-economic development and every-day services to the population should be enhanced. Trade union personnel should take a more active attitude towards the solution of industrial and social matters. The initiative of Komsomol organizations should be developed in every way.

It is important to strengthen ideological sectors with highly qualified and trained personnel, who fully feel the pulse of the times and have a deep understanding of the essence of the tasks assigned, and who are capable of effectively propagating the party's policy, of convincing and organizing people.

The further strengthening of socialist legality and of law and order in the country assigns new responsible tasks to the personnel of law enforcement agencies. They should persistently learn to work in the conditions of broader democracy and openness, relying on the trust and support of the whole people.

The report points out that new demands are being placed on the personnel departments dealing with foreign policy in the energetic international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The military personnel, who perform the responsible mission of the defence of peace and security of the Soviet people, is a major concern of ours.

It is emphasized in conclusion that an important role belongs to the new year 1987 -- the year of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- in the realization of the party's strategic course towards acceleration. It is essential not only to consolidate and develop what has been achieved in the first year of the five-year plan period, but also to include long-term factors of growth more fully and to make positive changes irreversible.

The Political Bureau proceeds from the assumption that the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee is to formulate the main guidelines for the renovation of our personnel policy and to determine the main tasks of this work in the conditions of reorganization.

BREZHNEV'S SON-IN-LAW ARRESTED FOR CORRUPTION

AFP Notes Details

AU031630 Paris AFP in English 1545 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, Feb 3 (AFP) -- The Kremlin confirmed Tuesday that Yuriy Churbanov, the son-in-law of former Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev and a former first deputy interior minister, has been arrested for corruption.

In a news conference here, Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, in response to questioning by foreign reporters, said "yes, he has been arrested and an inquiry is underway." Mr. Churbanov's detention had previously been unofficially reported in Moscow. Mr. Gerasimov said Mr. Churbanov has been "accused of corruption and receiving bribes." One report circulating in Moscow said he had been involved in the black market sale of luxury cars. The spokesman refused to say when Mr. Churbanov had been detained or if or where he was being held; nor did he mention the family link with Mr. Brezhnev, who died in December, 1982.

Mr. Churbanov, 50, is the third husband of Mr. Brezhnev's daughter Galina. He was suddenly demoted in December 1984 after holding the job for nearly five years.

Confirmation of Mr. Churbanov's arrest comes less than a week after Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made a blistering attack on the Brezhnev era during a Central Committee plenum.

Mr. Brezhnev's daughter has been widely linked to other corruption cases in the Soviet Union, even when her father was alive. At the beginning of 1982 one of her closet friends, Anatoliy Kolevatov, then director of the Moscow Circus, was arrested and later found guilty of trafficking gold and hard currency worth an estimated million dollars. In September 1984 he was jailed for 13 years. Galina Brezhnev was also closely linked to one of the circus performers, known as "Boris the Gypsy." Another of her close friends, Yuriy Sokolov, the director of a prestigious Moscow department store, was arrested in 1984 for trafficking and corruption and sentenced to death. His execution was announced in July, 1984.

In March 1986, Mr. Brezhnev's son Yuriy lost his place as a non-voting member on the Communist Party's Central Committee. Two months later he was relieved of his duties as a deputy minister at the Foreign Trade Ministry and retired at the age of 52.

TASS Announcement

LD031601 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- A spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs has said at today's briefing for Soviet and Foreign journalists that Yuriy Churbanov, former first deputy minister of internal affairs of the USSR, was arrested. He is accused of graft and corruption.

AMBARTSUMOV LOOKS AT 1987 CHANGES IN ECONOMY, SOCIETY

WA031000 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 1, 4 Jan 87 p 3

["Political Diary" column by Yevgeny Ambartsumov: "Looking Forwards"]

[Text] What will 1987 be like for the Soviet people? In all appearances, it will be tense -- interesting but not easy. A reconstruction that is unprecedented in its extensiveness has commenced and far-reaching plans have been worked out. The question today is how to implement them. After all, in effect, we are entering upon a new life in which past experience will only be of limited value.

The increased rate in our economic growth is encouraging. Although the day-to-day reality with its concerns for daily food, with its shortages and queues has hardly changed so far. But when you start repairs in your home, don't the inconveniences multiply? But then, after repairs, it becomes much easier.

In the new year the projected reforms will enter into force -- the new order of economic management, the laws pertaining to state enterprises and individual labour. Sweeping changes will occur in our society. Horizontal, direct ties will pressure vertical, hierarchical ones, and management will be complemented by self-management. The economic reform will get bogged down unless it entails a political reform. It is clear that the principles and orientations of the reconstruction enter into a contradiction with the structures inherited from the past. They will inevitably have to be changed, and some of them -- cancelled.

When laying out a green lawn, wise gardeners do not pave the paths at once, but wait till people tread them where they find it convenient. Perhaps we, too, should trust real life and work: let people create their own paths rather than have some prescribe them in advance.

The zealots of "ideological purity" may raise an objection: suppose the paths do not lead where we want and lead where we don't want them to? Let's answer with a proverb: nothing ventured nothing gained. Existing socialism owes its strength not to scheme but to diversity, to its taking into account the vital, day-to-day interests of the population.

The encouraging slogan "more socialism" presupposes its definite understanding. Today we have arrived at a conclusion: state employment is not an indulgence for disorder and stagnation, but neither is individual, family or artel (cooperative) labour a taboo for existing socialism.

A new mode of thinking and a new life are being born in pains: after all, not infrequently the dead catches the living. An example of this were the events in Alma-Ata. The groups of local youth that took to the street found themselves on the side of anti-social forces taking exception to the revolutionary transformations which give us the only hope. In short, they did not know what they were doing in opposing their own social interests.

The Alma-Ata riots remind me of similar events that occurred 30 years ago in Tbilisi. At that time the Georgian youth rose in defence of the myth about the vozhd (leader) whose first strike -- out of a long row of the so-called breaches of legality -- fell upon his homeland, Georgia. But, as it turned out, it takes time to conceptualize one's own history. Today the outstanding Georgian director Abuladze, with his film "Repentance", has dealt a just but ruthless blow at this personage. "Repentance" is an indication of genuine, authentic national self-awareness.

The repleteness and intensiveness of revolutionary periods is universally known. The year 1987 will carry on the revolutionary reconstruction and therefore, together with the year 1986, will probably be no less meaningful than some parade-ridden decade in the past. Accomplishments will not take place without conflicts and difficulties. But without accomplishments it is impossible to live, and uninteresting.

BUTENKO ON RECONSTRUCTION, SOCIAL STRUGGLE IN SOCIETY

WA031200 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 1, 4 Jan 87 p 12

[Article by Professor Anatoly Butenko, D. Sc. (Philosophy) under the "Problems and Solutions" rubric: "Reconstruction and Social Struggle in Society"]

[Text] One distinguishing feature of Soviet society today is a heightened struggle of the new against the old, of the forces of progress and renewal against the conservative and bureaucratic forces. The struggle of the new against the old is a law governing the improvement of socialist society; but at different stages of development and under different specific conditions this struggle assumes sometimes more, sometimes less acute forms.

Four Positions [subhead]

Why has this constantly arising and soluble contradiction of social life now acquired such an acute character?

This is due to the fact that since the 27th CPSU Congress the Soviet Union has been in the process of restructuring every aspect of life as the indispensable condition for accelerating the country's socio-economic development. The proceedings of the Congress stirred everyone, and its decisions provided a formidable dynamic impetus to society. The atmosphere of exactingness and strictness, openness and truthfulness, which prevailed at the Congress, galvanized the political awareness of the masses and set them in motion, for, as Lenin said, "...The only effective force that compels changes is popular revolutionary energy."

The working people are demanding ever more resolutely that the reconstruction be carried out everywhere and assume a businesslike character.

However, it would be wrong to believe that everyone in Soviet society is thinking and acting alike, in the spirit of the Congress' decisions. If this were so, the reconstruction would have already been accomplished and all that would remain would be to reap its fruits. But this is not so. As was pointed out at the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee in June 1986, "the reorganization is still unduly slow. The switchover to quality, efficiency and new management methods is difficult and painful".

In Soviet society, as was stressed at the same Plenary Meeting, there are three social forces which are adopting a different attitude to the decisions of the Congress and are acting differently. The people doing good work nowadays are those who have resolutely backed the stand of the 27th Congress, who have become vigorously involved in the common drive, who are sparing neither time nor effort and are fitting in effectively with the process of reorganization. However, there are quite a few people who, while realizing the political need to work in a new way, simply do not know how to do this in practice. They must be helped in every way possible. And, lastly, there are those who have not yet grasped the essence of current changes, who are sticking to a wait-and-see position or do not believe in the success of the economic and political breakthrough the Party has mapped out. Speaking to the party activists of the Krasnodar Territory, Mikhail Gorbachev named one more group, the fourth. He said: "Time has shown that there are also quite a few of those who understand perfectly well what reconstruction

means. But, understanding what its consequences will be, these people do not accept it. It goes against the grain with them, so to speak."

How is this position of theirs to be explained and is it at all fortuitous? "It is precisely those people," as noted in the same speech, "who would like to give less to society and take more from it. We have talked about them for many years, but only now have we decided to lay claims to them in the proper way. Such people can be found among workers and peasants and among leading officials and workers in the apparatus. They are also to be found among our intelligentsia."

It stands to reason that a struggle is going on, and must go on, between those who actively stand up for the decisions of the Congress, who hold a worthy place in the reconstruction, and those who are resisting it in one way or another, not believing in its success, or those with whom it simply "goes against the grain", who actively "do not accept it". Moreover, this struggle does not remain the same all the time: the farther the reconstruction advances, the sharper the struggle becomes. Why?

People and Interests [subhead]

The special acuteness of the present-day struggle is due, first and foremost, to the breadth of the reconstruction: ever more numerous strata of working people are joining this process in every new sphere. The confrontation between progressive and conservative social forces is unfolding on an ever widening bridgehead.

And this process will further intensify, because more and more people are coming to understand that it is no longer possible to live, work and think in the old way.

The special acuteness of the present-day struggle of the new against the old is also to be explained by the depth of current changes: it is already demanding much of people, and if it has not yet affected or poorly affected someone today, it will affect, and do so very thoroughly, tomorrow.

Lastly, the struggle is being exacerbated by the high degree of concern on the part of the contending forces, championing their positions and their interests. To get a better idea of this key issue and a better clarity of the situation which has taken shape in Soviet society in the past few decades, there is a need to take the following into account.

It is an elementary truth for Marxism that nothing is done and nothing is accomplished in social life without a definite human interest. Everything there is in the life of society -- either good or bad, irrespective of whether this concerns slogans, calls or practical actions themselves -- all of this does not fall from out of the sky, but is done by real people and by them alone. "People always have been," Lenin wrote, "the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and they always will be until they have learnt to seek out the interests of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises."

More often than not this truism of materialism and Marxism is applied to the future, saying that if we want to do something, to achieve something, to bring some idea to fruition, it has to be connected with people's interests, there is a need to rekindle their interest in this idea and do everything possible for this idea to grip the masses. If this is so -- and it is evidently impossible to refute the above -- then, consequently, whatever has already been done in life, or embodied in particular living realities, has also been accomplished and done by virtue of someone's interest or to someone's advantage. Let us make one more step: it means that not only everything good but also everything bad there is in our life has also been born by virtue of someone's advantage. Hence red tape of formalism, eyewash and servility, and not only

corruption and padding, are not some fortuitous faceless overgrowths on the social organism that have fallen from the sky -- no, these are the products of the activity of real people, a result of someone's interest, to someone's advantage. Even if this interest consisted in doing nothing and lazying around and the advantage implied the simple convenience to act only on orders from above, not to think for oneself, not to assume responsibility for decision making.

Hardly anyone fails also to understand that stagnation phenomena have become rooted and the positions of anti-social forces have grown stronger through omissions in work during the past two decades of Soviet society's development. "We must admit today," it was said at the Congress, "that owing to a slackening of control and for a number of other reasons groups of people have appeared with a distinct proprietory mentality and a scornful attitude to the interests of society." Moreover, the carriers of these proprietory sentiments are not former "small holders", philistines, etc. These sentiments are to be found in people from different social groups and classes. They were reared and nurtured not by petty-bourgeois atmosphere, but by the environment in which the alliance of morally degenerated officials and embezzlers of material benefits, an alliance based on corruption, dictated more and more often its own canons of morality, its own standards of conduct and its own understanding of prestige. After losing the socialist values and the social orientation inherent in the new person of socialist society, these people with distinctly pronounced proprietory sentiments got hold of many methods to satisfy their ambitions and reach their ideals that are profoundly alien to socialism. Having believed in their impunity on the basis of past experience, they maintained that they were the incarnation of the way of life which was about to be institutionalized.

The reconstruction went against the grain with these groups of the population. Nor is it surprising: having learned to snatch more from the state with the help of "write-ups" and "paddings", as well as "sitting around looking busy" and "smoke breaks", meetings intead of work, or simply by means of direct pilfering and profiteering, they are perfectly well aware of what the consequences of the reconstruction will be. Given its consistent implementation, they will really have to work and work hard to honestly earn their income, and they are not accustomed to this and do not want to get accustomed to it either.

The course mapped out by the 27th CPSU Congress is spearheaded against such social "spongers" who have lost the image of honest workers, and is aimed to eradicate the negative phenomena on which these people used to parasitize. It inevitably evokes fierce resistance from these groups of the population and other anti-social forces seeking to retain whatever they have unlawfully appropriated or stolen, and to keep their former positions and possibilities.

These are the main reasons of the growing struggle of the new against the old in Soviet society. Speaking at the conference of heads of social sciences departments at higher schools, Mikhail Gorbachev said: "A sharp, and not always open, but always uncompromising struggle of ideas, psychological orientations, and modes of thinking and conduct is going on in the course of the reconstruction of our life and its renovation. The old way will not give up without a battle."

What does the present struggle amount to and what are its prospects?

The Drama of Life [subhead]

The struggle is not a sum total of individual clashes of quarrelsome personalities, nor a collision of different characters or mentalities, nor a confrontation of generations, but a social struggle with its own firm social causes. A social struggle within triumphant socialism? Is this at all possible? Isn't it an attempt to extend the class struggle to socialist society?

Not at all! Such apprehensions are groundless. They can be harboured only by those who either through ignorance or mistake erroneously identify everything social with class. No one is talking about continuing a struggle of class against class, that is, the class struggle in a society in which there are no longer social-class antagonisms. The social class in question is by no means linked to social-class antagonisms or even to class delimitating boundaries, but to the social positions and socially meaningful actions of people: its protagonists and their opposites are to be found in every large social group and in every social class. But this does not make the social confrontation any less acute.

Speaking at the 4th Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia on October 22, 1986, I.P. Kalin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Moldavian SSR, said: "A struggle is going on, a tough battle against the sworn enemies of the working class -- embezzlers, thieves, bribe takers and window dressers. They are, in effect, little different from the kulaks and NEP-men who were parasites living on the young Soviet Republic. The main burden of this struggle is still ahead. There is a need to build, as was stressed in the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee, a united front of attack against all these dangerous social phenomena, to combat not individual facts, but to explode their very foundation -- their economic, social and political roots." Explaining the character of the anti-social forces' behaviour, the speaker went on to say: "In the present situation the latter-day parasites, pursuing their self-seeking interests, present a formidable danger and can inflict irreparable damage on our society. They do not relinquish their positions on their own free will, neither do they disarm themselves.

Perpetrating their dirty deeds far from the public eye, quietly profiting by the humaneness of our laws and our morality, under definite conditions they go over onto the attack, get together criminal groups, and when they sense the approach of exposure and retribution, they make no scruples about resorting to anything to evade it, such as currying favour, bribery, blackmail and even physical violence. Therefore we are not talking of imaginary enemies, but real enemies."

To those who have got used to thinking in terms of long-assimilated but unverified dogmas, it seems that such an acute social confrontation is in principle impossible in socialist society. However, Marxism-Leninism has never asserted that the social-class antagonism is the only source generating a clash of social interests, it has never maintained that the elimination of the opposite interests, nor has it ever denied that in a society with no exploiting classes to contend with, the realization of the new social ideals -- socialism and communism -- continues to be an object of social struggle.

Soviet society's life today is a cogent reminder of these unshakeable truths, which have been forgotten by some.

Considering the fact that the restructuring of every aspect of Soviet society is the result of social struggle -- a struggle which is very acute and complicated -- it would be wrong to see the course of the reconstruction as a straightforward process without difficulties or setbacks. "We do not hide difficulties, neither objective nor subjective," said Yegor Ligachev at the meeting to celebrate the anniversary of the October Revolution last year. "A struggle is in progress. It is the struggle of the forces of renewal against those who would like to derail reconstruction and to push us into the quagmire of economic stagnation and social apathy. There can be no concession to the obsolete, because what is at stake is the future of socialism and our country's fate." Being well aware of the full responsibility of the initiated undertaking, the CPSU is rallying the working people to take part in an uncompromising social struggle in the name of the goals set by the 27th Congress.

GORBACHEV, OTHERS SIGN ACTRESS' OBITUARY

PM031243 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 February 1987 First Edition carries on page 2 an obituary of actress Vera Ivlianovna Andzhaparidze, which is signed by the following:

"M.S. Gorbachev, G.A. Aliyev, A.A. Gromyko, Ye.K. Ligachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, P.N. Demichev, A.N. Yakovlev, D.I. Patiashvili, P.G. Gilashvili, O.Ye. Cherkeziya, Yu.P. Voronov, Yu.A. Sklyarov, A.N. Aksenov, V.G. Zakharov, A.I. Kamshalov, V.I. Mironenko, I.K. Arkhipova, B.R. Asatiani, A.A. Belyayev, Yu.K. Borisova, Ye.N. Gogoleva, I.O. Gorbachev, N.Sh. Dzhanberidze, G.N. Yenukidze, O.N. Yefremov, Ye.V. Zaytsev, V.V. Karpov, E.G. Klimov, K.Yu. Lavorv, G.D. Lordkipanidze, G.M. Markov, I.A. Naumenko, S.V. Obraztsov, N.A. Ponomarev, Ye.R. Simonov, A.I. Stepanova, R.R. Sturua, G.A. Tovstonogov, M.I. Tumanishvili, M.A. Ulyanov, T.N. Khrennikov, M.I. Tsarev, T.N. Chkheidze, R.D. Chkheidze, and E.N. Shengelaya."

BROCHURE ON JAN CPSU PLENUM MATERIALS PUBLISHED

LD022159 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 2 Feb 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Materials of the CPSU Central Committee plenum, which was held in Moscow from 27 to 28 January 1987, have been published in a separate brochure. It includes information reports on the plenum, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report on the restructuring of the cadre policy of the party, the concluding speech by Comrade Gorbachev, and the resolution of the plenum. The brochure has been published by the Politicheskaya Literatura publishing house.

ELECTIONS FOR SUPREME SOVIET SCHEDULED FOR 22 FEB

PM261023 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Elections Announced"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has adopted decrees scheduling for Sunday, 22 February 1987, the elections of deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union for Kuybyshev Oblast, Avtozavodskiy Electoral Okrug No 207; the Ukrainian SSR, Odessa Oblast, Odesskiy-Leninskiy Electoral Okrug No 499; the Kazakh SSR, Karaganda Oblast, Karagandinskiy-Kirovskiy Electoral Okrug No 631; the Kazakh SSR, Uralsk Oblast, Uralskiy Electoral Okrug No 650; the Kazakh SSR, Uralsk Oblast, Chapayevskiy Electoral Okrug No 651; the Kazakh SSR, Tselinograd Oblast, Tselinogradskiy rural Electoral Okrug No 653; the Moldavian SSR, Sorokskiy Electoral Okrug No 704; and the Kirghiz SSR, Narynskiy Electoral Okrug No 720; and of deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities for the Kazakh SSR, Saryagachskiy Electoral Okrug No 148; the Georgian SSR, Tbilisskiy-Ordzhonikidzevskiy Electoral Okrug No 165; the Kirghiz SSR, Alamedinskiy Electoral Okrug No 326; the Turkmen SSR, Kunya-Urgenchskiy Electoral Okrug No 435; the Adzhar ASSR, Khelvachaurskiy Electoral Okrug No 499; and the Udmurt ASSR, Mozhginskiy Electoral Okrug No 665.

The elections in the aforementioned elelctoral okrugs are being held to fill vacant seats.

MANAGEMENT OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC TIES REORGANIZED

PM291201 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No. 4 in Russian, Jan 87 (Signed to Press 15 Jan 87) pp 3-4

[Unattributed article on undated CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Resolution: "On Measures To Improve the Management of Foreign Economic Relations"]

[Text] Based on the decisions of the 27th party congress, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers deem it necessary to implement measures to radically restructure management, improve planning, and create an effective economic mechanism in the area of foreign economic relations. These measures must be an integral part of all the work to improve the leadership of the national economy. While maintaining and developing the principle of state monopoly in foreign economic activity, there is an urgent need to extend the rights and increase the responsibility of ministries, departments, associations, enterprises, and organizations in this area, ensure their entry into foreign markets, and strengthen their interest in developing international production sharing and accelerating the introduction of the latest achievements of science and technology, thereby boosting the effectiveness of foreign economic relations. The harmonious and fruitful working of the whole foreign economic complex and the boosting of its role in accelerating the country's socioeconomic development are of great statewide and political significance.

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers Resolve

I. In Improving the Organization of the Management of Foreign Economic Activity [subhead]

1. With a view to improving leadership of the foreign economic complex and increasing the level of coordination of the work of ministries, departments, and organizations engaged in trade and economic, currency and financial, and scientific and technical relations with foreign countries, it is deemed necessary to create The USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission as a standing organ of the USSR Council of Ministers.

2. It is laid down that the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission will direct the work of:

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade;
The USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations;
The USSR State Committee for Foreign Tourism;
The USSR Foreign Trade Bank;
The USSR Council of Ministers Main Administration for State Customs Control;
and all ministries and departments engaged in foreign economic relations and the Soviet sections of intergovernmental commissions for economic, scientific, and technical cooperation with foreign countries.

3. The USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission is to:

Draft proposals in the sphere of foreign economic policy and concepts for the development of foreign economic relations, including for individual regions and countries;

Implement measures to radically improve foreign economic activity and further develop and improve trade and economic, currency and financial, and scientific and technical relations with foreign countries, with a view to accelerating our country's socioeconomic progress;

Comprehensively and dynamically deepen economic integration with the socialist community countries and consolidate the USSR's position in the world economy;

Ensure active participation by ministries, departments, associations, and enterprises in foreign trade activity, production and scientific and technical cooperation, and international production sharing. And develop progressive, new forms of foreign economic relations;

Further improve the planning, stimulation, and management of foreign economic relations. And make broad use of economic methods of management, especially in organizing new forms of foreign economic relations;

Carry out work with other standing organs of the USSR Council of Ministers, ministries, and departments to radically change the structure of exports and imports of goods and services and expand the country's export potential;

Coordinate and monitor the work of ministries and departments in fulfilling the targets of the Comprehensive Program for the CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through 2000;

Ensure fulfillment of the Soviet Union's foreign economic commitments, and strengthen state discipline.

4. The USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission is to:

Examine draft future and current plans for foreign economic relations and monitor their conformity with the strategic trend in the development of foreign economic relations;

Systematically monitor the foreign economic activity of all ministries and departments and have them report on the fulfillment of CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions and state plans dealing with questions of foreign economic activity;

Adopt decisions on granting associations, enterprises, and organizations the right to carry out export-import operations;

Adopt decisions, within the limits of its competence as established by the present resolution, to be published in the form of USSR Council of Ministers rulings.

5. The standing organs of the USSR Council of Ministers, ministries, departments, and union republic councils of ministers are to submit foreign economic relations questions requiring a decision by the USSR Government for examination by the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission.

6. In order to elaborate major problems and prepare recommendations for the development fo foreign economic relations, it is deemed necessary to create the Scientific Economic Council of the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission.

7. It is laid down that the USSR Council of Ministers Foreign Economic Commission is to be headed by a chairman who is a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. It is to be composed of the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers who is the chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology; a Commission deputy chairman in charge of the Commission's combined Economic Department; a Commission deputy chairman who is chairman of the commission's Scientific Economic Council; the USSR minister of foreign trade; the chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; the USSR minister of finance; the first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan for general questions; a first deputy chairman of the USSR Gossnab; a USSR deputy foreign minister; and the first deputy chiefs of the USSR Council of Ministers' standing organs.

The USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman who is permanent USSR representative to CEMA and is responsible for the whole complex of questions of economic, scientific, and technical links with CEMA countries is to be first deputy chairman of th USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission.

8. In order to ensure that the functions imposed on the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission are exercised, a working apparatus of the commission is to be set up.

9. The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission is instructed, with the participation of the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, and the USSR Ministry of Justice, to prepare and submit to the USSR Council of Ministers a draft provision on the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission.

10. The role and responsibility of USSR embassies in implementing party policy in the area of foreign economic relations are to be strengthened.

11. With a view to actively involving them in foreign economic activity, associations, enterprises, and organizations are to be granted the right to establish direct links with enterprises and organizations in other CEMA countries and to resolve independently questions of production, scientific, and technical collaboration, including signing economic agreements and contracts to deliver products and render services connected with production sharing and development and determining the economic terms of cooperation.

A number of USSR and union republic ministries and departments, associations, and enterprises are to be granted the right to carry out export-import operations directly (including markets in capitalist and developing countries). In this connection it is deemed expedient to create as of 1 January 1987:

a) Financially autonomous foreign trade organizations in ministries and departments in accordance with Appendix 1 on the basis of their existing subdivisions and the foreign trade associations of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade.

The USSR ministries and departments granted the right to conduct export and import operations must carry out this activity on the basis of the obligation to apply the principles of financial autonomy, currency self-financing, and self-capitalization;

b) Financially autonomous foreign trade firms within science and production and production associations, enterprises, and organizations which have the conditions for significant deliveries of high-quality products for export. Such firms are to be formed within associations and enterprises in accordance with Appendix 2.

In future decisions on granting USSR and union republic ministries and departments the right to direct entry into foreign markets are to be taken by the USSR Council of Ministers.

In handing over foreign trade functions to ministries, departments, associations, enterprises, and organizations, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade and the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations -- together with sector ministries and departments -- are to ensure that the newly created foreign trade association and firms are fully staffed with qualified specialists, so as to create conditions for their effective work.

The USSR Gosplan, with the participation of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, the USSR Ministry of Finance, and other interested ministries and departments, is to elaborate and submit to the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission a draft provision of USSR ministry and department foreign trade organizations and association, enterprise, and organization foreign trade firms.

12. It is laid down that the leaders of USSR ministries and departments are responsible for developing foreign economic relations, making effective use of them, and ensuring the quality and technical standard of exported products.

In connection with the handover of foreign economic activity functions to USSR ministries and departments, associations, enterprises, and organizations, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade and the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations are to ensure monitoring of the observance of state interests in foreign markets.

13. It is laid down that the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade is to retain the obligation to carry out trade in fuel, raw materials, food, machinery and equipment (in the area which remains in its control), and other goods of statewide significance.

It is deemed expedient to concentrate in the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations all questions concerning the construction of installations abroad and on USSR territory with the participation of foreign organizations and fimrs and the related delivery of equipment sets.

The USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission and the USSR Gosstroy, together with the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, are to submit proposals to the USSR Council of Ministers to improve the organization of USSR-aided construction of installations abroad.

Functions connected with assimiliating constructed enterprises and other installations and ensuring the conditions for their effective operation are to be imposed on the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations.

14. The USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade and the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, with the participation of the USSR Ministry of Finance and the USSR Ministry of Justice, are to prepare and submit to the USSR Council of Ministers proposals on changing the structure of the central apparatus and draft provisions governing them.

II. In Improving Planning and Financial Autonomy [subhead]

15. The USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission, the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, the USSR Ministry of Finance, USSR ministries and departments, and union republic councils of ministers are to radically improve planning of foreign economic activity, bring it into line with contemporary demands, resolutely abandon the established practice of allocating only residual resources to exports, and stop permitting unwarranted imports. In this connection the system of planning indicators for foreign economic activity and the procedure for shaping plans is to be reviewed.

Starting in 1987 targets for currency earnings, including freely convertible currency, are to be introduced as part of the approved planning indicators by which to assess the results of the economic activity of ministries, departments, foreign trade associations, and also associations, enterprises, and organizations with the right of entry into foreign markets.

Associations and enterprises are to include in their plans indicators for the development of international production sharing. The volumes of products delivered under production sharing arrangements are to be taken into account in plans for the economic and social development of the relevant sectors.

16. The USSR Gosplan and the USSR Ministry of Finance are to submit a combined currency plan (USSR balance of payments) as part of the state 5-year plans for the USSR's economic and social development.

17. USSR ministries and departments, union republic councils of ministers, associations, and enterprises must elaborate a special section on foreign economic relations in their economic and social development plans.

18. The USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission and the USSR Gosplan -- with the participation of the USSR Council of Ministers standing organs, ministries, and departments -- are to elaborate a program for the development of the export base, based on the country's foreign economic relations strategy.

19. With a view to developing and strengthening financial autonomy and the principles of self-financing and self-capitalizaton there is to be a switch from order-schedules and commissions to a system of financially autonomous contract relations in carrying out export-import operations.

Associations, enterprises, and organizations which are not to enter foreign markets independently are granted the right to fix the best export terms for their products when concluding economic contracts with foreign trade associations of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade and other ministries and departments, ensuring that the highest possible currency earnings are obtained.

Here the interest of foreign trade associations as intermediaries in export-import operations is to be ensured by commission allocations from these operations depending on their size.

The USSR Gossnab, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, the USSR Council of Ministers State Arbitration Board, and the USSR Ministry of Justice are to lay down the procedure for switching to contract relations in foreign economic activity and submit appropriate proposals to the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission.

20. It is laid down that the results of foreign economic activity by associations, enterprises, and organizations must be an organic part of the overall results of their economic activity and have a direct influence on the formation of economic incentive funds. With this aim in view appraisal of the export-import activity of associations, enterprises, and organizations is to be based on actual contract prices, converted into Soviet rubles according to the different currency rates -- which whould provide incentives for increasing export efficiency and the technical standard and quality of products in accordance with world market demands and for reducing nonrational imports.

21. With a view to boosting economic interest and expanding independence in developing exports and renewing the production base, currency allocation funds are to be created in association, enterprises, and organizations to finance export-import operations.

Currency funds are to be formed, by means of allocations based on stable long-term normatives, from the sale of finished products and services, and also from the total earnings from shared production delivery operations.

USSR ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers are to be permitted to centralize up to 10 percent of the currency allocation fund of associations, enterprises, and organizations. The remainder is exempt from removal by higher organs and form any restriction on its use.

Centralized currency funds of USSR ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers are to be formed in the basis of the aforementioned percentage of currency allocations. These funds are to be used to provide help as necessary to associations, enterprises, and organizations in developing exports and also for financing export-import operations.

22. A procedure is to be laid down whereby ministries, departments, associations, enterprises, and organizations are to import machinery, equipment, materials, and other goods needed for retooling and remodeling production and carrying out scientific research, experimental design, and other work using only their own or borrowed currency reserves.

Ministries, departments, associations, enterprises, and organizations are to be permittted -- within the limits of their existing currency reserves -- to purchase the necessary products for these purposes either independently or via foreign trade organizations. Such purchases -- on the demand of associations, enterprises, and organizations, and correspondingly of ministries and departments -- are to be included in full in the imports plan and realized as a priority.

Leaders of ministries, departments, associations, enterprises, and organizations are personally responsible for the rational and effective utilization of currency reserves in the interests of developing production and improving its technical standard.

23. The USSR Foreign Trade Bank is permitted to grant credits in foreign currency for a period of up to 4 years to associations, enterprises, and organizations to create and develop export production facilities, so that these credits are paid off by their currency earnings from the export of products.

The USSR Ministry of Finance and the USSR Foreign Trade Bank, with the participation of the USSR Gosplan, are to elaborate and approve a procedure for granting and paying off the aforementioned credits.

24. It is laid down that, if they fail to fulfill plan targets for the export of goods or contract commitments, associations, enterprises, and organizations are to bear the economic responsibility for this and make good the loss from their existing currency reserves.

25. The commissions for improving management, planning, and the economic mechanism are to elaborate a system of bonus awards for and economic responsibility of associations, enterprises, and organizations supplying products for export as an organic part of the internal economic mechanism, on the basis of the principles of full financial autonomy, self-financing, and self-capitalization.

26. The USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR Gosbank, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, and the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations -- with the participation of interested ministries and departments -- are to introduce changes into the relevant departmental normative documents regulations, and method instructions, taking account of the requirements of the present resolution.

27. The USSR Ministry of Justice, with the participation of interested ministries and departments, is to prepare and submit to the USSR Council of Ministers proposals on inserting into existing legislation the changes arising from the present resolution.

Appendix 1: List of Ministries and Departments in Which Financially Autonomous Foreign Trade Organizations Are To Be Created [subhead]

The USSR Gossnab
The USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee
The USSR State Committee for Science and Technology
The USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet
The USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry
The USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports
The USSR Ministry of Geology
The USSR Main Administration of Geodesy and Cartography
The USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade
The USSR Ministry of Power Machine Building
The USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building
The USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry
The USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry
The USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building
The USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems
The USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry
The USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building
The USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry
The USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry
The USSR Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry
The Tsentrosoyuz

Appendix 2: List of Associations and Enterprises in Which Financially Autonomous Foreign Trade Firms Are To Be Created. [subhead]

USSR Ministry of Power Machine Building

The A.A. Zhdanov "Izhorskiy Zavod" Production Association (Leningrad)
The "Leningradskiy Metallicheskiy Zavod" Turbine Construction Production Association
The V.I. Lenin "Nevskiy Zavod" Production Association (Leningrad)
The "Krasnyy Kotelshchik" Production Association Named for the 60th Anniversary of the USSR (Taganrog, Rostiv Oblast)
The S.M. Kirov "Kharkovskiy Turbinnyy Zavod" Atomic Turbine Construction Production Association

USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building

The "Uralmash" Production Association (Sverdlovsk)
The V.I. Lenin "Bryanskiy Mashinostroitelnyy Zavod" Production Association

USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry

The "All-Union Scientific Research, Planning and Design, and Technological Institute of the Cable Industry" Science and Production Association (Moscow)
The Leningrad S.M. Kirov "Elektrosila" Electrical Machine Building Production Association
The Moscow V.V. Kuybyshev "Electrozavod" Production Association
The V.I. Lenin "Zaporozhtransformator" Production Association
The Saransk "Svetotekhnika" Production Association

USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry

The "AVTOVAZ" Production Association (Tolyatti)
The "Moskvich" Production Association (Moscow)
The "GAZ" Production Association (Gorkiy)
The "KAMAZ" Production Association (Brezhnev)
The "ZIL" Production Association (Moscow)
The "AVTOZAZ" Production Association (Zaporozhne)
The "BELAVTOMAZ" Production Association (Zhodino, Minsk Oblast)

The USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building

The V.I. Lenin "Minskiy Traktornyy Zavod" Production Association
The A.A. Zhdanov "Vladimirskiy Traktornyy Zavod" Production Association
The "Lipetskiy Traktornyy Zavod" Production Association Named for the 23d CPSU Congress

The S. Ordzhonikidze "Kharkovskiy Traktornyy Zavod" Production Association

USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems

The Kiev V.I. Lenin "Elektronmash" Production Association
The North Donetsk "Impuls" Science and Production Association Named for the 25th CPSU Congress
The "Mosrentgen" Production Association (Moscow)
The Leningrad "Elektronmash" Science and Production Association
The Leningrad "Burevestnik" Science and Production Association
The Sumy "Elektron" Production Association
The Orel "Prompribor" Production Association
The S.M. Kirov First Moscow Watch and Clock Plant

USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry

The Ivanovo Machine Tool Building Production Association Named for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR
The Moscow "Krasnyy Proletariy" Machine Tool Building Production Association
The Minsk Machine Tool Building Production Association Named for the October Revolution
The Odessa Machine Tool Building Production Association
The Kiev M. Gorkiy Machine Tool Building Production Association
The Voronezh Production Association for the Production of Forging and Press Equipment
The Ulyanovsk Machine Tool Building Production Association of Heavy and Special Purpose Machine Tools
The Ryazan Machine Tool Building Production Association

USSR Ministry of Chemical Machine Building

The Sumy M.V. Frunze Machine Building Science and Production Association
The Berdichev "Progress" Chemical Machine Building Production Association
The Volgograd Petroleum Machine Building Production Association

USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Feed Production

The Riga "Rigaselmash" Plant

USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances

The Cheboksary Production Association for the Production of Shuttleless Looms
The Production Association for the Production of Domestic Refrigerators (Minsk)

USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building

The Mogilev "Stromavtoliniya" Production Association
The Odessa Heavy Crane Construction Production Association Named for the January Rising
The "Krasnyy Ekskavator" Production Association Named for the 60th Anniversary of the USSR (Kiev)
The Tallinn "Talleks" Production Association

USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry

The "Polimir" Production Association Named for the 50th Anniversary of the Belorussian SSR (Novopolotsk)
The Rubezhnoye "Krasitel" Production Association (Rubezhnoye, Voroshilovgrad Oblast)
The Kazan "Organicheskiy Sintez" Production Association

USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry

The "Novopolotskorgsintez" Production Association Named for the 25th CPSU Congress
The "Bashneftekhimzavody" Territorial Association (Ufa)
The "Bobruyskshina" Production Association
The "Nizhnekamskneftekhim" Production Association
The Volgograd Industrial Carbon Plant
The Tolyatti "Sintezkauchuk" Production Association
The "Kirishinefteorgsintez" Production Association Named for the 50th Anniversary of the Komsomol

USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry

The Novorossiysk L.I. Brezhnev "Novorostsement" Combine
The Lvov "Raduga" Glass Production Association
The Leningrad Artistic Glass Plant
The Borisov F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Crystal Plant
The "Kirovorgadnerudprom" Production Association
The "Chelyabinskmramor" Production Association
The "Sayanmramor" Stone-Working Combine (Sayanogorsk, Krasnoyarsk Kray)

USSR Academy of Medical Sciences

The All-Union Scientific Center for Cardiology